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Abstract

The subject of this thesis is an examination of the English literary background of Oliver Goldsmith's final poem, Retaliation, and a detailed consideration of the structure and portraits of the poem itself. Three types of literary works of the Restoration and eighteenth century, though not wholly exclusive of one another, provide the most fruitful background for this investigation: verse satires, poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets, and literary portraits.

Retaliation is first placed into its current critical context. Goldsmith's portraiture skills are identified as one of his major strengths as a poet. The central problem for criticism of his major poems lies in a determination of the role of the author in his works.

Retaliation is next considered in the context of mid-eighteenth-century verse satire. The deterioration of the poet's self-portrait as a satiric norm is illustrated by examples from Pope, Churchill, and Goldsmith. The eighteenth-century opposition between Horatian and Juvenalian satire is briefly discussed, and Retaliation is found to approximate closely to the pole of Horatian or "laughing" satire.

The second chapter of the thesis is concerned with the eighteenth-century "low" style of poems written in anapaestic tetrameter couplets between Prior and Goldsmith. An attempt is made to explore the range of poems composed in this metrical form. More emphasis is placed upon poems which are similar to Goldsmith's anapaestic pieces in structure, diction, or intention. Evidence is provided to suggest that there is greater continuity in the anapaestic tradition of familiar epistles, character-sketches, and light satires than has sometimes been thought. In order to discover
the characteristics of the anapaestic poetry of this period and to sug-
gest why Goldsmith chose this metrical form for his poems of social life,
the works of Prior, Swift, and Christopher Anstey are emphasized, but
pieces by less influential writers of anapaests—including Pope, John
Byrom, Edward Moore, Shenstone, Gray, Richard Owen Cambridge, and John
Cunningham—are also examined. Goldsmith's other anapaestic poems, the
"Letter to Mrs. Bunbury" and The Haunch of Venison, are discussed primarily
for what they reveal about Goldsmith's manner of self-portraiture.

The final chapter of this thesis consists of an extended analysis
of the structure and portraits of Retaliation. The question of unity
in the poem is of particular importance, because the poem is unfinished.
While the occasional nature of the poem has determined much about its struc-
ture, Goldsmith paid careful attention to the arrangement of the epitaphs
in order to facilitate a series of contrasts from which his satiric norms
may be inferred. The occasional nature of the poem also induced Goldsmith
to strive for a balanced, or equivocating, effect in his portraiture. Many
of the satiric touches in Retaliation together constitute a playful commen-
tary on serious satire. In the course of interpreting the portraits in
Retaliation, I have investigated the variety of Goldsmith's portraiture
techniques and suggested some comparisons with satiric portraits by Dryden
and Pope.
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Introduction

In this thesis I shall examine the structure and portraits of Oliver Goldsmith's *Retaliation*, Goldsmith's last poem and probably his best—The *Deserted Village* and The *Traveller* excepted. I shall consider *Retaliation* in two main contexts: as a prominent verse satire of the late eighteenth century and as an important poem in the tradition of the eighteenth-century "low" style composed in anapaestic tetrameter couplets.

In a consideration of *Retaliation*, as of any late eighteenth-century satiric poem, some attention may profitably be paid to the decline of verse satire after the death of Pope. A discussion of *Retaliation* in the context of the decline of verse satire constitutes the subject of my first chapter. In my second chapter I shall examine numerous poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets, in order to establish the characteristics of the verse form and to suggest what elements of the "low" style appealed to Goldsmith and why he may have chosen anapaests for his poems of social life. My final chapter will be a close analysis of *Retaliation*, focusing on the question of unity in this unfinished poem and on the matter of portraiture technique, a skill of Goldsmith's which has not previously been examined in sufficient detail. Before proceeding to these subjects, I should like to place Goldsmith and his poetry into their current critical context, paying particular attention to the central question of the manner of self-presentation in his three best poems.

"Who wanders not with Erin's wandering bard?/Who sits not down with Auburn's pastor mild,/To take upon his knee the shyest child?"¹ It is
more than a hundred years since Walter Savage Landor wrote these lines, and there is now considerable doubt how his rhetorical questions should be answered. G. S. Rousseau insists that, with few exceptions, no one wanders anymore through Goldsmith's Characters of European nations or cares to sit down for very long with the Village Preacher:

Historians of the Industrial Revolution, like J. H. Plumb, and critics of the literature produced by that revolution, like Raymond Williams, have looked at The Traveller and Deserted Village en passant. But others, poets most of all, have forgotten them, don't read them, and probably never will again.²

Lest Rousseau's opinions be taken to reflect not on Goldsmith but on the popular image of the modern poet as a man unversed in English literary tradition, it should be remarked that apparently sophomore students of literature cannot be induced to enjoy The Deserted Village either.³ What is even more disturbing to admirers of Goldsmith's serious poetry is that Robert H. Hopkins, the author of one of the most important books on Goldsmith, likewise questions the value of the two major poems: "Their rhetoric is worthy of study, as are their poetic structures, but there must be discrimination between literary history for the purposes of understanding an era and those works that genuinely endure beyond that era."⁴ The chequered critical heritage of all great eighteenth-century writers might occasion suspicion, or at least hope, that the passing-bell has been prematurely rung. It should be recalled that, whatever the case with Rousseau's modern poets, some of this century's greatest poets did not forget Goldsmith. He figures more than once in the poetry of Yeats:

Oliver Goldsmith sang what he had seen,
Roads full of beggars, cattle in the fields
But never saw the trefoil stained with blood
The avenging leaf those fields raised up against it.⁵

While it might be argued that Yeats's interest was nationalistic rather
than aesthetic, T. S. Eliot had no such bias when he classed Goldsmith as a major poet. Further cause for hope arises from two excellent essays on *The Deserted Village*, neither one confined to the rhetoric of the poem, in which the respective authors have explored not only the complexity and power of the poetry but also its relevance to modern experience.

While at present Goldsmith's serious poetry has been largely abandoned in favour of his comic prose, especially *The Vicar of Wakefield*, in Goldsmith's own lifetime and for many years afterwards he was considered primarily a poet, by all but his booksellers. According to Katharine C. Balderston, it was only as an afterthought that the prose was even included in the edition of Goldsmith's works planned by Bishop Percy, which eventually appeared in 1802 (dated 1801). It is immediately apparent on reading through Goldsmith's *Collected Works* that the ideas on trade and luxury, national characters and human happiness, which are espoused in *The Deserted Village* and *The Traveller*, though not perhaps original with Goldsmith, are nonetheless central to his thought. The importance of these two works for Goldsmith has recently been re-emphasized by Roger Lonsdale: "Biographically, his two major poems, both written with pains-taking care and with no immediate financial motive, almost certainly represent what he himself considered the only true manifestations of his literary integrity and talent." While such biographical considerations cannot, of course, determine modern evaluations of the works, they should certainly be made to temper low estimations based on assertions about the general unpopularity or "excessive didacticism" of these poems.

As Landor's verses suggest, Goldsmith's serious poetry was truly popular in the nineteenth century, as long as it could be praised for exhibiting such qualities as "pathos, nature and simplicity." But at some point in the Victorian period, readers discovered that Goldsmith's
serious poems were neither natural nor harmonious but rather written according to "the time's false tradition of 'poetic diction,'" in verse offering all the variety of a "dull tramway." Thereupon, they were damned with faint praise: "Of Goldsmith's poetry it is enough to say that the taste and artistic training of the age in which he lived did not admit of any better." Goldsmith's was the so-called Age of Prose, "the most hated of all epochs in literary history by the nineteenth century," and the most refractory to modern attempts at classification and definition. The concept of "pre-Romanticism" gained general acceptance for a time, or so it would appear from the vigorous opposition to the notion for the past twenty years. Goldsmith studies have been profoundly affected by this notion, since the standard biography of Goldsmith, that by Ralph Wardle, has been widely criticized for advancing the view "that Goldsmith was a pre-romantic in an insufferably neo-classical age." The opposite view—that Goldsmith, along with Johnson, was a "neo-Classical" reactionary resisting the "pre-Romantic" currents of the new age—also has its adherents. Literary studies of the period have since been relieved of the "false teleology" inherent in "pre-Romanticism," partly through the efforts of Northrop Frye; but the label that Frye proposed as a substitute, "The Age of Sensibility," has not met with general acceptance. How could it, when the greatest English writer of the period, Samuel Johnson, is also a powerful opponent of sentimentalism? Goldsmith's own position with regard to sentimentalism is not easily defined, and one widely held view has been that, while Goldsmith offered a critique of the "Man of Feeling" in The Good Natur'd Man, he succumbed to the prevailing "sensibility" in The Deserted Village. At the same time, the notion that there was an upsurge in emotionalism in late eighteenth-century literature has not gone unchallenged. Bertrand H. Bronson, citing Goldsmith's
two great "Augustan" poems as part of his evidence, proposes that it is
at the beginning of the eighteenth century that "the air is heavy with
unrestrained emotion," and at the end that the values of Classicism are
most refined and those who enunciate them most assured. Donald Greene,
in re-examining the supposed origins of sensibility in latitudinarianism,
suggests that statistical investigations are necessary if it is to be
demonstrated that more sentimental literature was produced in the mid-
eighteenth century than in other periods.

The critical trend which has prevailed for more than a decade now
is that Goldsmith is an "Augustan." The label "Augustan" in English lit-
erary history, when any attempt has been made to define the term precisely,
has generally been applied to the first four decades of the eighteenth
century. Several critics, however, have extended the term's reference.
Prominent among these is Paul Fussell, who uses "the term to suggest the
'orthodox' ethical and rhetorical tradition wherever found in the eight-
eighteenth century." While Fussell's exposition of the characteristics of
eighteenth-century conservative writers and his discussion of the kinds
of imagery to be found in these writers are valuable, his view of the
literary history of the period—pitting the "Augustan humanists" from Swift
to Burke against "the optimistic tradition bounded on one end by Defoe
and on the other by Burns and Blake," and including, among others, Gold-
smith—has been much less helpful to literary study. It is difficult
not to get the impression that Fussell's "Augustan humanists" are a se-
lect group representing what is best in eighteenth-century literature,
and that Fussell's selection is somewhat arbitrary. Robert H. Hopkins,
for instance, disagrees with Fussell and states that both Fielding and
Goldsmith should have been included in the "Augustan" tradition.

Other critics, in bringing Fussell's discussion of "Augustan" imagery to bear
on Goldsmith's works, write as though Goldsmith had not been explicitly excluded from the number of the "Augustan humanists." The minor controversy over the relationship of Goldsmith to "Augustan humanism," resulting from Fussell's equation of "Augustan" with "good," provides considerable support, I believe, for Howard D. Weinbrot's contention that the prescriptive use of the term "Augustan" is interfering with accurate readings of eighteenth-century works. It remains to be seen if "Augustanism," as Weinbrot hopes, will go the way of "pre-Romanticism." But for now, at least, the occupation of attempting to label Goldsmith's time continues to thrive. Samuel H. Woods, Jr., while he prefers to see Goldsmith linked with "Augustanism" than with "pre-Romanticism," nevertheless regrets "[t]hat the scholarly community has not fully recognized the differences between the Augustan mode and what Quintana has called 'Georgian'."

Another recent critic who is justifiably concerned about the treatment of the latter half of the eighteenth century as a transitional period and who deplores the use of the terms "post-Augustan" and "pre-Romantic" has arrived at the conclusion that a number of writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Goldsmith, might best be called "Grecian," since Athenian and Alexandrian models had replaced those of Rome—a highly dubious suggestion, at least in the case of Goldsmith.

This mania for supplying and destroying labels has contributed, as might be expected, to some widely divergent opinions about the poems. The difference between the discussion of a Goldsmith poem as a "pre-Romantic" document and as an "Augustan" one can be reduced to a single point—the role of the author in his work. For the critic with a "pre-Romantic" bias, the "I" of the poems is Goldsmith himself. In this view, then, Goldsmith gushes with nostalgia in The Deserted Village: His public statements on trade and luxury tend to be lost in a crowd of autobiographical
identifications. Auburn is Lissoy; the Village Preacher is Goldsmith's father or his brother Henry or perhaps his Uncle Contarine. To the Lissoy extremists, even so relatively minor a figure as "The sad historian of the pensive plain" (l. 136)\(^2^9\) can be identified as a local named Catherine Giraghty,\(^3^0\) though Goldsmith's most recent biographer offers the much more fantastic suggestion of an identification with Goldsmith's mother.\(^3^1\)

For the critic with an "Augustan" bias, on the other hand, the "I" of Goldsmith's poems is a persona, serving a rhetorical function in an impersonal work. Here is a representative comment by a critic of this school on The Deserted Village: "it appears to me more often than not that Goldsmith deploys irony at the speaker's expense much as he does in Letters from a Citizen of the World and The Vicar of Wakefield."\(^3^2\) As can be seen from this statement, one of the motives of these critics is to discover a high degree of consistency in the various works of the Goldsmith canon. As Irvin Ehrenpreis has shown, the concept of the persona, especially in combination with irony, can be of invaluable assistance in discovering consistency in an author's works.\(^3^3\) If a particular statement or attitude—say, a sentimental longing for home—is inconsistent with a critic's general view of an author, it may be found that the offending statement or attitude is actually that of a persona who is treated ironically by the author. For the critics subscribing to the "Augustan" view of Goldsmith, the other main motive for emphasizing the persona, besides a desire for consistency, is to show that Goldsmith is like other "Augustans." Since it is still widely believed that "Augustan" art is impersonal and that a poet such as Pope employs a variety of masks for rhetorical purposes,\(^3^4\) an emphasis on the persona in Goldsmith helps to demonstrate that he is, in fact, an "Augustan."

I believe that the critics with an "Augustan" bias are correct, insofar as they emphasize the similarity between Goldsmith's poems and Pope's
or Johnson's. I also agree, in part, with the critics who have written with a "pre-Romantic" bias: Goldsmith's poems do contain powerful personal emotions, and it is undeniable that his literary works, in both poetry and prose, frequently embody an important element of autobiography. I cannot, however, accept the assumption that the art of the "Augustans" is either devoid of emotion or impersonal. Perhaps it is worth noting that Maynard Mack, who some years ago in "The Muse of Satire" viewed Pope's poems in terms of rhetorical masks, has in a more recent essay examined Pope from a radically different point of view. Thirty years ago it was necessary to defend Pope, and satirists in general, against charges of vanity and personal malignancy. To effect this defense, Mack and others championed the theory of authorial irrelevance: the author was banished from his works in favour of personae, who were quite independent. To-day, the direction in which literary study is tending is toward discovering how men and women reveal themselves in their works—hence, the current popularity of autobiography and travel literature. Hence, too, Mack's recent comment on Pope: "... Horace's satires and epistles supply a powerful opportunity for favorable self-presentation that Pope seized and magnified, and it may well be that one reason he did so was to satisfy a psychic as well as poetic need to establish ... an amiable identity."

It is only recently that readers have become sensitive to the language of the heart that so often lies just under and behind Pope's immense urbanity and irony. It is not, then, primarily through the presence and absence of powerful emotions that the major poetry of different periods can be distinguished: the passions are constant; the language in which they are communicated changes, and must be learned to be intensely felt.

While I believe that Goldsmith expresses personal emotions in many of his poems, I do not therefore think that the notion of the persona...
can be completely dispensed with, at least not in *The Deserted Village* and *The Traveller*. Contemporary readers of *The Deserted Village*, if John Hawkesworth can be taken as representative, did not see the "I" of this poem simply as Goldsmith: "The Author writes in the character of a native of a country village, to which he gives the name of Auburn..."\(^{39}\)

This, it seems to me, is a sophisticated perception about how the poem works. A kind of dramatization does take place. In "Auburn" a kind of fiction has been created. But the relationship between poet and character is also carefully specified: Goldsmith is "in the character"; he is the animating principle, the controlling intelligence. In *The Deserted Village* the speaker is not a fully developed dramatic creation, independent of the author, capable of having his own emotions or holding his own opinions about luxury and depopulation. Nor, I think, does Goldsmith treat this "character" ironically, unless perhaps in the same manner that we all, at times, owing to self-awareness, treat ourselves with irony. An example, involving the portrait of the Village Schoolmaster, will help to clarify this point:

Yet he was kind, or if severe in aught,  
The love he bore to learning was in fault;  
The village all declared how much he knew;  
'Twas certain he could write, and cypher too;  
Lands he could measure, terms and tides presage,  
And even the story ran that he could gauge.  
In arguing too, the parson owned his skill,  
For even tho' vanquished, he could argue still;  
While words of learned length, and thundering sound,  
Amazed the gazing rustics ranged around,  
And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,  
That one small head could carry all he knew.  
(11. 205-16)

To Goldsmith as actor in the poem, we attribute the attitude of sincere affection for, tempered by a certain condescension toward, both the schoolmaster and the villagers. To Goldsmith as poet, we attribute such effects
of versification as the assonance and alliteration in a line such as "Amazed the gazing rustics ranged around," effects which, in this instance, are notably expressive of a gently mocking tone.\textsuperscript{40} The schoolmaster, I think it can be said, is treated with irony, the kind of gentle irony for which Goldsmith is best known.\textsuperscript{41} The schoolmaster, we infer, is something of a pedant; he makes a display of his knowledge. His folly is shown in Goldsmith's ironic praise of his ability to argue even after an argument has been lost. The learning of which the schoolmaster is proud is shown to reside in such things as being able to "write, and cypher." He is not noted for the appropriateness of his expressions nor for the force of his arguments, but for "words of learned length, and thundering sound." The sketch is appropriately concluded with the depreciatory phrase "one small head." In considering the portrait of the Village Schoolmaster, the reader may recall an earlier passage in the poem:

\begin{quote}
I still had hopes, for pride attends us still,
Amidst the swains to shew my book-learned skill,
Around my fire and evening groupe to draw,
And tell of all I felt, and all I saw. . . .
(11. 89-92)
\end{quote}

The similarities are sufficiently striking, but the differences between the portrait of the Village Schoolmaster and this instance of self-portrayal are even more instructive. Although both the Schoolmaster and Goldsmith as actor in the poem are proud of their learning and either do or would use it to attain a position of prominence among simple villagers, the persona possesses a self-awareness that the Schoolmaster lacks. He recognizes and confesses that pride is his motivation. Such is the self-analysis undertaken by a truly intelligent and truly sensitive man. The Schoolmaster is portrayed completely from the outside, and is gently mocked. Goldsmith as actor in the poem reveals his inner motivations, and we sym-
pathize with him, as we are intended to.

It is essential to determine the proper place of Goldsmith in his poems for two related reasons. First, I believe that it is through examining a work in relation to its author and its age that we can most fully extend its significance to our own time. Artifice should not be divorced from personality; aesthetic values should not be separated from human. Literary works should be considered in a way not very different from that in which Samuel Johnson thought of them—"as human acts to be judged in relation to the agency of their production and appreciation." The second reason for determining afresh Goldsmith's place in his works is that some of the low estimations of his two major poems have been directly based on the assumption that they involve the kind of ironic personae that have been found in certain of his prose works. This is the case with the introduction to the most recent edition of Goldsmith's poems and plays, even though the introduction is otherwise valuable for the consideration given to the classification of Goldsmith's poems in terms of the audience for which they were intended. Tom Davis finds that Goldsmith

was continually protecting himself from his audience, with irony, parody, buffoonery. This ironic stance is one of the principal sources of Goldsmith's greatness; but I shall try to show that his highest claim to our admiration is based on those works in which the ironies are left behind, and we are presented with an extraordinary integrity and directness.

Only in one of his poems did Goldsmith drop the varieties of cover that protect the poet from his audience, and that is the Retaliation. It is for this reason that this is, to my mind, his finest poem, in spite of its lack of finish and its unevenness.

Retaliation is indeed a fine poem, but it is somewhat perverse to praise it at the expense of Goldsmith's other poems, as Davis does, especially on such dubious grounds as these.

In considering Goldsmith's use of the literary portrait in Retalia-
tion, I am examining part of what has usually been thought Goldsmith's best poetry. Hazlitt's remarks are representative:

His Traveller contains masterly national sketches. The Deserted Village is sometimes spun out into mawkish sentimentality; but the characters of the Village Schoolmaster, and the Village Clergyman, redeem a hundred faults. His Retaliation is a poem of exquisite spirit, humour, and freedom of style.44

Except for the short-lived popularity of Edwin and Angelina, the three poems mentioned by Hazlitt are the ones which have always been regarded as Goldsmith's masterpieces. The reason for this high regard has likewise been almost universally shared: an appreciation for Goldsmith's perceptive analyses of character, whether of nations, social and professional types, or individuals. It is strange, therefore, that though many of the literary conventions pertinent to The Traveller and The Deserted Village have been discussed at length, there has been no study of Goldsmith's art of literary portraiture in these poems. Although Retaliation has frequently been praised in passing and although the circumstances surrounding its composition have been the object of inquiry in two scholarly articles, this poem has yet to be the central subject of a critical essay. Goldsmith scholars have been aware, for several years, of the need for such studies:

Adequate criticism of "Retaliation" is almost nonexistent and indeed difficult, because the portraits in the poem are of actual people, and the extent of Goldsmith's use of literary conventions for verse portraits and the extent to which the poem possesses unity still await investigation.45

It is quite right to state that difficult questions are raised since real people are portrayed in Retaliation. What were the relations between Goldsmith and the men portrayed in the poem like? Are the sketches biographically accurate? Do they contain satiric distortions? Such diffi-
culties, however, are by no means unique to Retaliation. Achitophel and Zimri, Atticus and Sporus are representations of actual people as well. Since Goldsmith used the real names of the men he sketched, Retaliation may actually present fewer difficulties in this matter than those encountered in such a poem as the Epistle to a Lady, concerning which numerous disputes have arisen and much work has been done in the identification of Pope's nymphs. While biographical matters are vital to a full understanding of Retaliation, I shall devote myself primarily to examining the literary conventions involved in the satiric genre, the verse portraits, and the metrical form. Since the literary portrait tradition in the eighteenth century is largely a satiric tradition, some consideration will be given to the vexed question of the decline of verse satire in the mid-eighteenth century. I shall attempt to determine the extent to which Retaliation may be called satiric. I shall also comment briefly upon the anapaestic tetrameter couplet, examining other eighteenth-century poems in this metrical form and suggesting what effect the metre has on the nature of Goldsmith's Retaliation. I shall address the matter of unity in Retaliation—surely a central question for a poem which Goldsmith did not live to give the finishing touches to. In attempting to trace the tradition of which Retaliation is part, I shall be considering numerous eighteenth-century poems. One thing which unites many of the works to be examined in this thesis is the question of self-portrayal in eighteenth-century poetry. At the heart of my subject is the epitaph from Retaliation that we do not have, and perhaps were never intended to have.
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tainly, strong proponents of man's natural benevolence did arise during the course of the century. However, it is folly to view all expressions of humanitarianism, all praise of the simple life, and all suggestions that environment and education might corrupt men, as signs of dogmatic benevolism, primitivism, or sentimentalism. While this is perhaps but stating the obvious, such points have sometimes been ignored in assessments of Goldsmith either as a satirist recognizing the depravity of man or as a sentimentalist too charitable to be capable of satire. I am not proposing, therefore, to view Goldsmith as some kind of divided personality; rather, he is a widely read individual whose ideas were formed through numerous influences. It has long been recognized that the particular social conditions of Ireland were of significance in the formation of Goldsmith's social and political views. Likewise complicating any simple view of Goldsmith is his admiration for and indebtedness to French literature: John Montague calls him "the most considerable English literary representative of the powerful current of ideas then prevalent in Europe." While differing views of human nature did find expression in Goldsmith's time, it is not on this basis alone that writers are to be classified or that a capacity for satire is to be found.

The circumstances surrounding the composition of *Retaliation* have been frequently discussed, and they are of considerable importance in determining what kind of poem Goldsmith intended to write and whether or not he exercised a capacity for satire. The origins of the poem may be summarized as follows. Goldsmith was a member of a group which met at the St. James's Coffee-House, a group which included all those portrayed in *Retaliation* and possibly Johnson and Joseph Cradock as well. At a meeting of this group, probably at the end of January, 1774, it was decided that the members should write epitaphs for one another. On this occasion Garrick, Cumberland, and Dr. Thomas Barnard apparently produced epitaphs,
in which Goldsmith and his peculiarities figured prominently; and Reynolds may have sketched Goldsmith in pen and ink. The only epitaph to survive in full is Garrick's: "Here lies NOLLY Goldsmith, for shortness call'd Noll, / Who wrote like an angel, but talk'd like poor Poll." There seems to be general agreement that Goldsmith was upset by this couplet. After quoting a slightly different version, William Cooke remarks that "Goldsmith was stung to the heart at the laugh which this little *jeu d'esprit* occasioned. . . ." Cumberland notes that, after epitaphs by Garrick and Dr. Barnard were read, he "perceived Oliver was rather sore." Cumberland claims that his own verses on Goldsmith "were serious and complimentary," and he recollects the final line as, "All mourn the poet, I lament the man." Retaliation appears to have been read to the group by Goldsmith on 9 March 1774, at a meeting from which Garrick was absent and at which Caleb Whitefoord and Topham Beauclerk, though not regular members, were present.

The reactions of those portrayed toward Goldsmith's epitaphs on them might be helpful for determining what kind of poem Goldsmith intended to write. Unfortunately, there is little reliable information concerning these reactions, except in the case of Cumberland, and there is little agreement concerning how Kearsly obtained the copy of the poem which he published on 19 April 1774. While Cumberland was pleased with Goldsmith's epitaph, Mrs. Thrale thought that he had missed the irony. Thomas Davies believes "that Garrick's features in the Retaliation are somewhat exaggerated" and that Garrick "was displeased with some strokes of this character." Against this stands Garrick's less specific comment that "the whole on all sides was done with the greatest good humour." Between Goldsmith's death on 4 April 1774 and the publication of the poem, Horace Walpole had this to say about Goldsmith: "His numerous friends
neglected him shamefully at last, as if they had no business with him when it was too serious to laugh. He had lately written epitaphs for them all, some of which hurt, and perhaps made them not sorry that his own was the first necessary."¹⁷ Walpole's comment on the epitaphs must not be accepted without qualification, for it is written to support the dubious statement that in his final illness Goldsmith was neglected by his friends. Oliver W. Ferguson quotes a letter from Lady Phillipina Knight to Dr. William Farr on the subject of Retaliation, in which she affirms that "the whole Publication is against his friends choice and done by they know not whom."¹⁸ Cooke, writing some years after the fact, and without first-hand knowledge of the Coffee-House events, comments similarly on the poem's reception there: "though some praised it, and others seemed highly delighted with it, they still thought a publication of it not altogether so proper."¹⁹ Cooke believes that the fear engendered by Goldsmith's thus having displayed his abilities as a bold satirist resulted in changed relationships with his friends. This opinion does not, however, accord with the atmosphere of good humour and merriment that is generally believed to have prevailed during the meetings at the St. James's Coffee-House.²⁰ Joshua Reynolds remarks on the surprise that Retaliation occasioned, but does not suggest that anyone was particularly disconcerted by the poem: "Even his friends did not think him capable of marking with so much sagacity and precision the striking features of their characters as he did in the epitaphs."²¹ Although, from Cooke's account and from the anonymous letter to Kearsly prefixed to the first edition of the poem, numerous copies would seem to have been circulating in manuscript, any one of which could have reached the bookseller, Cumberland states that it was the members of the group themselves who decided to publish the poem.²²

One observation that might be made about these initial reactions
to Retaliation is that persons who were not directly concerned—Mrs. Thrale, Thomas Davies, Horace Walpole, Lady Phillippina Knight, and William Cooke—were inclined to view the poem as much more harshly satiric than those—like Cumberland, Garrick, and Reynolds—who were directly involved. The notices in the Reviews, following the publication of the poem, offer remarks about wit and delicate satire, good humour and just portrayal, that have been echoed by the great majority of readers ever since. There is little foundation in the genesis of Retaliation and the initial reactions to it for discovering indignant satire in the poem, though some of the conventions evident in harsher satires may be found. What is most important to note about the composition of the poem is the audience for which it was intended. Like The Haunch of Venison and the "[Letter to Mrs. Bunbury]," Goldsmith's other two poems in anapaestic couplets, Retaliation was written, not for publication, but for the amusement of a small group of friends. In the case of Retaliation, however, Goldsmith had as an additional impetus to excellence the desire to take precedence in witty portraiture over so clever a man as Garrick. Of course, as Goldsmith wrote, he probably came to conceive of a somewhat larger public, the poem being too substantial and too good to remain a private jeu d'esprit—hence the manuscripts that were circulated beyond the members of the Coffee-House society. Although Goldsmith no doubt wished to gain the respect of those portrayed, by displaying an ability that they did not know he possessed, he did not wish to draw portraits that would end social intercourse with such men as the Burkes and Garrick, or even Joseph Hickey.

Since Retaliation was written for a small and highly cultivated audience, one of the reasons adduced for the decline of satire—that the development of a larger and less discriminating reading public made it
difficult for writers to use irony with confidence—is clearly not appli-
cable. W. B. Carnochan is one critic who finds a distinction between
the use of irony in satire of the early and of the late eighteenth cen-
tury: "What is involved, in the most inclusive description of post-Augus-
tan satire, is this: the restraints and complications of irony, and es-
pecially of ironic diminution, are abated or lacking altogether. . . ." 24
Another writer finds one of the reasons for the success of Alexander Pope
and the relative failure of a satirist of the 1790's, William Gifford,
to reside in the changing poet-audience relationship: Pope implies much
in his satires, making them complex and delightful, whereas Gifford, unable
to trust his audience, is wholly explicit. 25 In Goldsmith's lifetime,
however, there would still appear to have been a considerable audience
for satire. The most notable satirist of these years, Charles Churchill,
while he admittedly capitalized on the topicality of theatrical and po-
itical subjects, had considerable financial and popular success. Gold-
smith's reference, in the Dedication to The Traveller, to a "half-witted
thing" who writes "tawdry lampoons" on behalf of party (IV, 247), has
been taken as an indication of Goldsmith's opinion of Churchill's poetry.
Noting this fact, Robert H. Hopkins makes a comment pertinent to the de-
cline of satire in the mid-eighteenth century:

Churchill's verse satire offers another explanation for why
Johnson, Goldsmith, and the other great conservative writers
of this period did not write comic verse satire in the tradi-
tion of Swift and Pope. The radicals working for social and
political change had appropriated aggressive verse satire as
a weapon for their cause. 26

Johnson's and Goldsmith's avoidance of Churchill's brand of verse satire
can, I think, be better viewed as an aesthetic choice than as a reaction
to a political situation. In Johnson's greatest verse satire, The Vanity
of Human Wishes, he draws portraits of historical rather than contemporary
figures. In the same way, Goldsmith, writing his major poetry in some sense for posterity, wished to avoid the topical allusions and partisan political subjects that appeared in many of the best English models of verse satire and that only when his impetus to write was more immediate, as with Retaliation, did he compose the kind of poem that would require considerable annotation to be understood by a broad reading public.

The hierarchy of classical genres has a central place in eighteenth-century critical writing and is of significance in any consideration of the decline of verse satire. The mid-eighteenth century saw the elevation of such species of didactic poetry as georgic and satire; by the beginning of the nineteenth century the hierarchy had been altered again, and lyric forms were in the ascendency. Accompanying this shift toward the lyric at the end of the eighteenth century were precepts about the proper subjects for poetry. Many of the classical genres conventionally dealt with subjects that were now considered prosaic rather than poetic. Thomas Lockwood has described this process:

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, then, the province of what is called true poetry simply shrinks—though we must suppose that it makes up in depth what it loses in extensiveness. The tendency was to allow the province to include human feeling but not human wit, natural imagery but not artificial, meditative and symbolic modes of expression but not discursive or dialectical. Outside the province lay satires, history poems, verse essays, imitations, epistles, mock-epics, realistic and moral fables, theatrical prologues and epilogues, epitaphs, and epigrams.

The lower place accorded didactic poetry and the fact that some critics and poets began to view satiric subjects as inherently unpoetic played a significant part in the decline of verse satire. In the main, Goldsmith appears to have considered poems in terms of genres. The following passage from one of his early book reviews, though he is borrowing from the Encyclopédie, seems quite consistent with the views he expresses elsewhere:
"There is no species of poetry that has not its particular character; and this diversity, which the ancients have so religiously observed, is founded in nature itself. . . . Thus the pastoral never quits its pipe, in order to sound the trumpet; nor does elegy venture to strike the lyre" (I, 164). Similarly, Goldsmith's objections to sentimental comedy are based partly on classical definitions of the comic and tragic genres. Still it would be an oversimplification to place Goldsmith "clearly" into one tradition or another; for, though most of Goldsmith's poems are of the "unpoetic" kinds, he was perhaps not unaffected by the lyric shift. The heroic couplets of The Traveller and The Deserted Village have a greater tendency toward lyricism than do the couplets of Goldsmith's predecessors.29

The rise of the novel and of biography in the eighteenth century reveals certain facts about the decline of satire but is perhaps even more pertinent to the tradition of the literary portrait. Novels and biographies tend to raise in the reader the expectation of balanced character-writing, the representation of virtues as well as faults. The depiction of virtues in satiric portraits is minimal, and is usually associated with the device of concession, designed to heighten the satire by showing, for example, how a man with great natural advantages perversely abuses them:

Peace to all such! but were there One whose fires
True Genius kindles, and fair Fame inspires,
Blest with each Talent and each Art to please,
And born to write, converse, and live with ease....
(An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, ll. 193-96)30

Such an introduction to Addison's character renders everything that follows all the more damning, not least because of the impression of Pope's impartiality that these lines of praise create. Although something remains of the satiric concession in, for example, Goldsmith's epitaph on Edmund Burke, Goldsmith's portrait is considerably less satiric than Pope's.
Whereas in Pope the praise is subsidiary to the blame, in Goldsmith each seems to be there for its own sake. Pope offers moral condemnation of Addison; Goldsmith offers a balanced, or perhaps equivocating, view of Burke. Similar to the growing expectation for balanced portraiture is the career of the word "candour," which Mary Claire Randolph has traced through eighteenth-century satire. She notes that the satirist conventionally demanded "candour" from his critics and that readers came inevitably to make the same demand of the satirist in the treatment of his targets, thus threatening the techniques of distortion and exaggeration that are among the satirist's most powerful weapons. Of course, the novel and biography, by their very presence, were in competition with verse satire, and the amount of time spent by some of the greatest writers of mid-century in exploring the possibilities of fictional and non-fictional prose narratives had by necessity an adverse effect on the production of new verse satires.

A more complex issue arising from this opposition between the novel and biography on the one hand and verse satire on the other is the question of particularity and generality. The novel permitted and biography came to demand a high degree of particularity in characterization. In biography and equally in history minute details began to be valued for their own sake; in satiric portraits particulars are valuable only insofar as they are representative of a general idea. During the course of the century the locus of truth was displaced from general and abstract ideas to centre instead in particular facts and frequently, at least in poetry, in sense perceptions. Paul Fussell states that Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding "attained an authority almost scriptural during the eighteenth century," and as with Scripture widely divergent views were based on Locke's philosophy. In an essay on Goldsmith and
empiricism, John A. Dussinger states that "Goldsmith's conception of
the true sources of knowledge and wisdom seems to derive from Locke's theory
of the understanding." Locke provides at least one of the foundations
for the kind of "general truth" subscribed to by many eighteenth-century
writers. These writers, more than those of the next age, had a passion
for drawing distinctions between men and beasts and for, what perhaps
amounts to the same thing, making comparisons between men and animals
for satiric purposes. Locke finds the distinguishing mark of human be-
ings to be their ability to generalize:

If it may be doubted whether beasts compound and enlarge their
ideas that way to any degree, this, I think, I may be positive
in, that the power of abstracting is not at all in them, and
that the having of general ideas is that which puts a perfect
distinction betwixt man and brutes, and is an excellency which
the faculties of brutes do by no means attain to.

For Locke, general ideas are the most valuable: "General truths are most
looked after by the mind as those that most enlarge our knowledge; and,
by their comprehensiveness satisfying us at once of many particulars, en-
large our view and shorten our way to knowledge." A century later, in
the margin of a copy of Reynolds's Discourses, opposite a note in which
Edmund Burke states that the "disposition to abstractions . . . is the
great glory of the human mind," William Blake commented: To Generalize
is to be an Idiot To Particularize is the Alone Distinction of Merit--
General Knowledges are those Knowledges that Idiots possess." A notion,
in many ways contrary to that of "general nature," which seems to have
gained popularity between Locke's time and Blake's, and which is usually
seen as an extrapolation from Locke's philosophy, is the doctrine of the
association of ideas. Related to this, and likewise important in the
literature of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is the
idea of "local attachment": particular places are able to evoke in certain
people ideas peculiar to those places. Local attachment is a central motif in Goldsmith's *Traveller* and *Deserted Village*, but, as Alan D. McKillop has shown, in these poems local attachment is rejected for or reconciled with various forms of cosmopolitanism. All of these forces inclining literature toward particularity in natural description and character portrayal were destructive of satire, at least of the kind of satire in which truth resides in the essences of men as communicated through the particulars of human behaviour, and only to a smaller extent in the particulars themselves.

Where Goldsmith stands in relation to this complex of ideas is difficult to determine with precision. Goldsmith was, of course, a novelist, biographer, and writer of histories, and he undoubtedly strove for a balance between faults and virtues in the portrayal of such figures as Beau Nash, Lord Bolingbroke, and Dr. Primrose. At the same time he spoke out frequently and vehemently against versifiers whose predilection was for detailed description rather than for arousing the passions: "the puny pedant, who finds one undiscovered property in the polype, or describes an unheeded process in the skeleton of a mole, and whose mind, like his microscope, perceives nature only in detail; the rhymer, who makes smooth verses, and paints to our imagination when he should only speak to our hearts . . ." (I, 472). The efforts of the pedant and the rhymer are equally misapplied, for their vision is confined to particulars, and they communicate neither knowledge nor feeling. According to Goldsmith, the imagery of poetry should be striking rather than minutely exact; description should be natural rather than gaudy; and the affections should be aroused instead of ignored (II, 171, 388). Whereas he everywhere decries minuteness, Goldsmith is unwilling to allow that sublimity and its attendant passions may arise from obscurity. Hence his criticisms of Burke's
Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful:

Distinctness of imagery has ever been held productive of the sublime. The more strongly the poet or orator impresses the picture he would describe upon his own mind, the more apt will he be to paint it on the imagination of his reader. Not that, like Ovid, he should be minute in description; which, instead of impressing our imagination with a grand whole, divides our idea into several littlenesses. We only think the bold yet distinct strokes of a Virgil, far surpass the equally bold yet confused ones of Lucan.

(I, 3ln)

Goldsmith here reaffirms, against Burke's challenge, a tradition of literary pictorialism in which representative particulars suggest the full picture to the reader's imagination, rather than one in which sensuous detail is indulged for its own ornamental value.\(^{39}\) In poetical descriptions Goldsmith prefers the selection of a few details to the highly particularized images preferred by other mid-century poets, such as Joseph and Thomas Warton.\(^{40}\) The personified abstractions in the epitaph on Dr. Douglas, for example, depend largely on the reader's imagination for their pictorial effect. While Goldsmith opposes minutely detailed descriptions, his Characters of nations in The Traveller and portraits of his friends in Retaliation are presented with a balance between faults and virtues that is uncommon in the satiric portrait tradition.

Accompanying this growing tendency toward particularity is the impulse to regard an individual's peculiarities as endearing qualities rather than as reprehensible follies. Philip Pinkus observes that "[p]ity is one small, half-submerged element in the catharsis of satire."\(^{41}\) It is equally destructive to the satiric spirit for pity entirely to surface or sink. In the one instance, the reader has too much sympathy to participate in a moral judgement of the satiric target; in the other, the reader will be inclined to view the satirist as a character assassin,
rendered, by the absence of natural human sympathy, unfit to deliver a moral judgement on any man. The element of pity found in levels appropriate to satire can, perhaps, be best illustrated from the greatest of English verse satirists—Alexander Pope. In the portraits of Old Cotta and his son in the Epistle to Bathurst, Paul J. Alpers finds "a delicate, rather Shavian, pity which implies a broad and secure moral sense observing the comic phenomena." Another good example, one which well illustrates the technique of portraiture by sparse but significant details of setting and human behaviour, is the brief sketch of the "frugal Crone" in the Epistle to Cobham:

The frugal Crone, whom praying priests attend,
Still tries to save the hallow'd taper's end,
Collects her breath, as ebbing life retires,
For one puff more, and in that puff expires.
(ll. 238-41)

Jean H. Hagstrum calls this sketch "a mock sacra conversazione which illustrates the pictorialist critic's dictum that verbal art ought to catch the single and brief dramatic action on the canvas." In four lines Pope creates a little world of frugality; one instinctively feels, for instance, that even the "praying priests" are in attendance out of avarice. The representative actions of the Crone are conveyed by the three verbs "tries to save," "Collects," and "expires." While the first two are perfect expressions of her frugality, the pun on "expires" is a stroke of brilliance. The Crone blows out the "hallow'd" taper, an act that pitifully demonstrates her passion for frugality; but in exhaling she dies, the extinguished taper becoming a symbol of her extinguished life. Pope's compassion is inseparable from his mockery. Paul Fussell says that writers like Swift and Pope, "when contemplating man, will not know whether to laugh or to weep, and so will do both at once."

When this delicate
balance between tears and laughter is upset, when sympathy predominates
or when laughter is divorced from compassion for the lot of man and from
a judicial function, the kind of satire practised by Swift and Pope is
no longer possible.

Sympathy with the follies of mankind can be manifested simply in
a different manner of self-portrayal by the satirist: satirists in the
latter half of the eighteenth century came to present themselves as par-
icipating in the follies they depict. It may be useful to examine the
differing manner of self-portrayal in poems by Pope, Churchill, and Gold-
smith. What is remarkable about Pope's Horatian Imitations and the "origi-
inal" poems associated with those Imitations, An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot
and the Epilogue to the Satires, is the extent to which the character of
the satirist dominates the poems. Alexander Pope, wearing the mantle of
Horace, represents in these poems one of the more important expressions
of the satiric norm. The emphasis on the poet's personality is the char-
acteristic of the later Pope which Charles Churchill and other satirists
of the late eighteenth century chose to extend. Given the emphasis
on personality in some of the greatest satires of Pope, it is an over-
simplification to regard the decline of satire as the consequence of a
shift from traditional values as satiric norms to personalities intended,
but failing, to fulfill the same function, in other words, as a shift
from common sense to individual moral sense. Moreover, if "Byron is a
'Romantic' satirist, in the basic sense that he wrote from outside soci-
ety, against conventional beliefs and practices, against the Establish-
ment," Pope at the end of the First Dialogue of the Epilogue to the
Satires would seem to fit a similar description. In the same way that it
is not in the absence and presence of emotion, but in the type of emotion
or, perhaps, in the language of emotion that "Augustans" and Romantics
are to be distinguished; so, I believe, it is not in the absence and presence of personality, but in the manner of self-presentation that early eighteenth-century satirists may be distinguished from those who followed.

Recognizing that Pope presents many sides of his personality in his satires, I have chosen two striking passages, the first from An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot:

Not Fortune's Worshipper, nor Fashion's Fool,
Not Lucre's Madman, nor Ambition's Tool,
Not proud, nor servile, be one Poet's praise
That, if he pleas'd, he pleas'd by manly ways;
That Flatt'ry, ev'n to Kings, he held a shame,
And thought a Lye in Verse or Prose the same:
That not in Fancy's Maze he wander'd long,
But stoop'd to Truth, and moraliz'd his song:
That not for Fame, but Virtue's better end,
He stood the furious Foe, the timid Friend. . . .
(ll. 334-43)

Although it is evident that Pope is writing about himself (Pope's own footnotes substantiate the fact that he indeed suffered, for Virtue's sake, the abuses he catalogues), the third person and the past tense are used as distancing devices. Of course, the details that Pope has chosen have been largely dictated by the position of this self-portrait immediately following the portrait of Sporus. Thus, the absence of pride and servility from his character is opposed to "Wit that can creep, and Pride that licks the dust" (l. 333), his "manly ways" to Sporus' effeminacy, his Truth to Sporus' lies, and so on. In this passage Pope justifies satire on the grounds of extreme personal provocation; in the following, from the Epilogue to the Satires, quite other grounds—those of moral duty—are supplied:47

Ask you what Provocation I have had?
The strong Antipathy of Good to Bad.
When Truth or Virtue an Affront endures,
Th' Affront is mine, my Friend, and should be yours.
Mine, as a Foe profess'd to false Pretence,
Who think a Coxcomb's Honour like his Sense;
Mine, as a Friend to ev'ry worthy mind;
And mine as Man, who feel for all mankind.

Pr. You're strangely proud.
P. So proud, I am no Slave:
So impudent, I own myself no Knave:
So odd, my Country's Ruin makes me grave.
Yes, I am proud; I must be proud to see
Men not afraid of God, afraid of me:
Safe from the Bar, the Pulpit, and the Throne,
Yet touch'd and sham'd by Ridicule alone.

(Dialogue II, II. 197-211)

Some of Pope's sentiments here are to be frequently encountered in defences of satire. Pope's claims for satire in the last couplet are not, for example, that different from Young's: "Instructive satire, true to virtue's cause! Thou shining supplement of public laws!" Goldsmith, in An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning, regards the satirist's function in society similarly: "An author may be considered as a merciful substitute to the legislature; he acts not by punishing crimes, but preventing them; however virtuous the present age, there may still be growing employment for ridicule, or reproof, for persuasion, or satire" (I, 314-15). There are no distancing devices in this second passage from Pope. Pope here uses a conventional argument to add weight to his personal indignation, not in any way to separate that indignation from himself. As Irvin Ehrenpreis says, "Pope's greatest powers appear in a work like the Epilogue to the Satires, which could not be more direct without turning ink to acid." 49

Another of Pope's sentiments here is worthy of comment in an examination of the decline of verse satire. Pope presents himself "as Man, who feel[es] for all mankind," likewise a conventional sentiment (from Terence), but one which sounds remarkably similar to expressions of universal benevolence which, so it has been said, are characteristic of sentimentalists, not satirists. The satirist Pope, it would seem, sees no contradiction between "feeling for all mankind" and attacking the enemies
of mankind, between the moral duty of Christian charity and the defence of Virtue, between good nature and satire. The more optimistic Richard Steele, in Tatler, No. 242, argues that the essential qualification for satirists is to be good-natured men: "These Men can behold Vice and Folly when they injure Persons to whom they are wholly unacquainted, with the same Severity as others resent the Ills they do themselves." Two years before the publication of the Epilogue to the Satires, Pope wrote similarly to Fortescue, though about judges not satirists:

... Good nature, properly felt, would make a rigorous Judge, & give a sort of Joy in passing the Sentence, both as it is Justice, and as it is Example; tho it might make him weep for it afterwards, & draw the more pity, not only to consider it is a Man that suffers, but that a Man can be capable of the Vice which deserves it.

I do not wish to obscure fundamental differences between Steele and Pope, but I do believe and I am concerned to show that in the eighteenth century "the battle line between the tough-minded and optimistic views of human nature" was often very fuzzily drawn indeed. While Pope clearly believes in the depravity of man, he still upholds an ideal of a judge who is a good-natured and feeling man.

In both of the passages I have quoted, however they may differ, Pope presents himself as a virtuous man. Indeed, such is the dominant idea which emerges from the portrayal of the poet in Pope's satires. The Conference, by Charles Churchill, though it lacks the power of Pope, is an apologia similar in subject and technique to the Epilogue to the Satires. A dialogue between a member of the nobility and Churchill, The Conference presents the opposing arguments of self-interest and virtue. While many of Churchill's sentiments would not be out of place in the Epilogue to the Satires, there is one point at which the self-presentation is quite different from anything in Pope:
C. Ah! what, my Lord, hath private life to do
With things of public Nature? why to view
Would You thus cruelly those scenes unfold,
Which, without pain and horror to behold,
Must speak me something more, or less than man;
Which Friends may pardon, but I never can?
Look back! a Thought which borders on despair,
Which human Nature must, yet cannot bear.
'Tis not the babbling of a busy world,
Where Praise and Censure are at random hurl'd,
Which can the meanest of my thoughts controul,
Or shake one settled purpose of my Soul.
Free and at large might their wild curses roam,
If All, if All alas! were well at home.
No—'tis the tale which angry Conscience tells,
When She with more than tragic horror swells
Each circumstance of guilt; when stern, but true,
She brings bad actions forth into review;
And, like the dread hand-writing on the wall,
Bids late Remorse awake at Reason's call,
Arm'd at all points bids Scorpion Vengeance pass,
And to the mind holds up Reflexion's glass,
The mind, which starting, heaves the heart-felt groan,
And hates that form She knows to be her own.

(11. 213-36)

In Pope there is only a hint of the satirist as erring man, in a passage
where the mirror image, as in Churchill, is used:

In me what Spots (for Spots I have) appear,
Will prove at least the Medium must be clear.
In this impartial Glass, my Muse intends
Fair to expose myself, my Foes, my Friends. . . .
(Satire II i, 11. 55-58)

It must, of course, be admitted that the rakish Churchill's transgressions
against conventional morality were much greater, or at least much more
obvious, than Pope's. Perhaps the most glaring difference between the
two satirists' manner of self-presentation is the separation between the
public and the private man effected in Churchill's first couplet. Pope
wants the reader to see the consistency of his private behaviour and his
public duty as a satirist. For Pope, satire is a supplement to the laws;
the satirist therefore is a judge of men's actions and an evaluator of
men's characters. In the same way that it is widely believed in our so-
ciety that immoral or illegal acts committed by a judge seriously compro-
mise the performance of his duty and call into question the integrity of
the courts, so for Pope, at least as he presents himself in his poems,
private life has a great deal to do with such "things of public Nature"
as the judicial function of the satirist. "If the attack on vice is to
be effective," suggests Alvin Kernan, "the character who delivers it must
appear the moral opposite of the world he condemns; he must be fervent,
he must be horrified at what he sees, and he must be able to distinguish
between vice and virtue without any philosophical shillyshallying about
'what is right and what is wrong?" Although Churchill does weaken
the moral position of the satirist by separating public actions from pri-
ivate life, the remainder of the self-portrait serves to vindicate in part
his competence as a judge. It is reassuring to know that Churchill is
capable of deep feelings, that he is unable to pardon his own faults even
though his friends may, that he is unmoved by the world's opinion, and
that his conscience is so very active.

The Prophecy of Famine, a more important poem than The Conference,
offers another kind of self-portrayal which was not extensively practised
by Pope. Churchill's modern biographer has noted how "Churchill the man
and Churchill the ironist are . . . revealed in the frequently used device
of self-distortion." Something of this nature occurs in the following
passage:

Me, whom no muse of heav'nly birth inspires,
No judgment tempers when rash genius fires,
Who boast no merit but mere knack of rhime,
Short gleams of sense, and satire out of time,
Who cannot follow where trim fancy leads
By prattling streams o'er flow'r-empurpled meads;
Who often, but without success, have pray'd
For apt ALLITERATION'S artful aid,
Who would, but cannot, with a master's skill
Goin fine new epithets, which mean no ill,
Me, thus uncouth, thus ev'ry way unfit
For pacing poesy, and ambling wit,
TASTE with contempt beholds, nor deigns to place
Amongst the lowest of her favour'd race.
(ll. 79-92)

The primary purpose of this passage is to oppose the manly satirist Churchill to the Scottish literary figures pensioned and encouraged by the Earl of Bute. Churchill's ironic self-depreciation is juxtaposed in the poem to his ironic praise of other literary figures, thus providing, at least to some extent, a moral and aesthetic standard by which his satiric targets may be judged. The satiric norm supplied by the satirist is, however, threatened somewhat by Churchill's irony. The technique of this verse paragraph is fairly obvious: Churchill ironically represents his avoidance of false taste in poetry as a lack of ability. Where the irony becomes more troublesome is in the opening lines of the following verse paragraph:

Thou, NATURE, art my goddess—to thy law
Myself I dedicate—hence slavish awe
Which bends to fashion, and obeys the rules,
Impos'd at first, and since observ'd by fools.
(ll. 93-96)

These lines are not immediately apprehended as ironic at all. They are clearly intended to echo the earlier couplet on the subject of modern Judgment, which is "Form'd after some great man, whose name breeds awe,/ Whose ev'ry sentence Fashion makes a law" (ll. 31-32), and Churchill certainly would not wish us to think him in "slavish awe" of the Earl of Bute. However, Churchill immediately proceeds to inform us that it is in Scotland that Nature "reigns throughout the year" (l. 108), information which compels the sympathetic reader to regard Nature with some suspicion as a literary norm. Further suspicion is aroused since the first line of this verse paragraph is borrowed from Edmund's first soliloquy in King
The concept of Nature has thus been coloured by the unpleasant associations of Scotland and bastardy. According to Churchill, the Scots—"nature's bastards" (l. 425), as he calls them later in the poem—are attempting to usurp the rightful inheritance of the English. The complexities of Churchill's irony have gone a considerable distance toward making the character of the satirist untenable as a satiric norm. Thomas Lockwood believes that only later in literary history do "we encounter, principally in John Wolcot (or 'Peter Pindar') and in Byron, the tone of self-deprecating irony that is positively fatal to the credibility of a poem as serious satire."

My survey of the changing manner of self-portrayal as a contributing factor in the decline of verse satire cannot, however, extend to Byron but must end in the decade following The Prophecy of Famine, with Oliver Goldsmith's Retaliation. As the circumstances surrounding the composition of the poem would indicate, it is somewhat dangerous to treat Retaliation, as P. K. Elkin does, as the best example of the "weakening process" that the satiric spirit was subjected to after the death of Pope. Unlike Pope's attack on Hervey and Churchill's on Hogarth, Goldsmith's "retaliation" was directed not against enemies but friends. There is, nevertheless, some significance in the fact that Goldsmith never chose to exercise his talent for personal satire in verse except on an occasion when everything had to be conducted with much good nature. Therefore, the circumstances of the poem's composition complicate, rather than invalidate, discussion of the relationship of self-portrayal in Retaliation to the decline of verse satire. Although Goldsmith did not write his own epitaph in Retaliation, he nonetheless appears as both speaker and actor in the poem. In the introductory section of the poem, in which the members of the group who met at the St. James's Coffee-House are compared to various
dishes, Goldsmith, as befits a dessert, appears last: "Magnanimous Goldsmith, a goosberry fool" (1. 16). By presenting himself in the third person and by punning on the word "fool," Goldsmith implies that he is regarded as the butt of the group. While magnanimity and good nature are not qualities inconsistent with the office of the satirist, foolishness, under most circumstances, certainly is. Goldsmith's magnanimity suggests that he is unwilling to find fault with his friends and that his retaliation is the product of reflection rather than resentment; his foolishness suggests that he is insufficiently perceptive to find all the hidden faults of his friends. Goldsmith, it seems to me, plays on these supposed traits of his character in the first epitaph, that on Thomas Barnard. Goldsmith first states that he was unable to discover any of Dean Barnard's faults: "If he had any faults, he has left us in doubt,/At least, in six weeks, I could not find 'em out" (ll. 25-26). This permits the criticism in the following couplet to emanate ostensibly from an objective source: "Yet some have declar'd, and it can't be denied 'em,/That sly-boots was curs-edly cunning to hide 'em" (ll. 27-28). Goldsmith uses the introductory section of the poem and the first epitaph to establish aspects of his own character—his magnanimity and, ironically, his foolishness—that influence the way the poem is read. Thus, while the poem is written in good humour, what criticism there is may be intensified by the knowledge that these are the observations of a magnanimous man. The portraits are intended to demonstrate that Goldsmith is not the fool, at least with regard to insights into behaviour and character, that his friends may have taken him for. At the same time, however, the inclusion of himself as one of the dishes to be served up during the course of the poem permits the poet little weight as a satiric norm. Goldsmith does not offer himself as a marked contrast to the men that he portrays in Retaliation.
Quite the reverse is the case.  

Retaliation is not a poem in which the judicial function of satire is presented very seriously. An alternation between subjective commentary and collective judgment is to be observed in the portraits. The opening verse paragraph concludes with a description of the situation which provides a pretext for the epitaphs that follow:

Here, waiter, more wine, let me sit while I'm able, 'Till all my companions sink under the table; 
Then with chaos and blunders encircling my head, 
Let me ponder, and tell what I think of the dead. 
(11. 19-22)

The poet, as he is presented here, is a burlesque of the judicial satirist. He is a man whose judgement is clouded with drink and who has no further object than to offer his opinions on his unconscious companions. His intention to "tell what [he] think[s] of the dead" might be viewed as a playful commentary on the conventional pretense of the satirist that he has portrayed no living characters. That Goldsmith intends these four lines as a burlesque on the serious exposers of hypocrisy is supported by internal evidence. In the epitaph in praise of the "detector" Dr. Douglas is a line which echoes that describing Goldsmith's state upon undertaking his satiric portraits: "When Satire and Censure encircl'd his throne" (1. 83) recalls "Then with chaos and blunders encircling my head." This amusing description of the drunken poet implies that the epitaphs to follow will be subjective commentary, but such is not really the case. With one major exception, subsequent reminders of the poet's presence are confined to half-line expressions, which, while important in maintaining a colloquial tone, serve no other function but to fill out the metre: "Here lies honest Richard, whose fate I must sigh at" (1. 51; my emphasis) or "Here Reynolds is laid, and to tell you my mind" (1. 137; my em-
phasis). Elsewhere in the poem there is an impression of objectivity, appropriate to the epitaph form, or of collective judgement, indicated by the use of the first-person plural: "Here lies our good Edmund, whose genius was such, we scarcely can praise it, or blame it too much" (ll. 29-30; my emphasis).

It has been remarked concerning self-portrayal in the works of Goldsmith that "he was well aware of his failings, and no one satirized more effectively than he the elements of conceit and credulity that made up his fullness as a human being." In Retaliation Goldsmith does not satirize his "conceit and credulity," unless in calling himself "a goosberry fool," but he does treat himself with irony for his occupation as a hack-writer:

When Satire and Censure encircl'd his throne,
I fear'd for your safety, I fear'd for my own;
But now he is gone, and we want a detector,
Our Dodds shall be pious, our Kenricks shall lecture;
Macpherson write bombast, and call it a style,
Our Townshend make speeches, and I shall compile. . .
(ll. 83-88)

Here Goldsmith portrays himself as a participant in the follies which he takes for his targets. Not only does he include himself among the friends metaphorically depicted as various dishes, but he includes himself among the hypocrites and misfits who deserve to be exposed by Douglas or another detector. Such self-portrayal weakens satire considerably. There is no reason given in the poem to consider Dodd's piety, Macpherson's bombast, or Townshend's speeches as representing any greater danger to society than do Goldsmith's compilations—compilations that were frequently written for the benefit of schoolboys. Even William Kenrick—an enemy if Goldsmith had one, an offender against "good taste and moral propriety," a man "at war with nearly all his contemporaries"—even he is exposed
for his lectures no differently than Goldsmith for his histories. At
the same time, though Goldsmith does not characterize these men as rep­
resentatives of evil, as animals, or as real threats to moral and social
order, he does single them out from the herd—by name—and thus partly
fills the role of detector vacated by the "death" of Douglas. Retaliation
is a fine poem, but the self-portrayal in the work is such that it contrib­
utes to render the poem less satirical than the satires of Pope or Church­
ill; in fact, it is quite another type of satire.

Retaliation is a comic poem; the best-known satires of Dryden, Pope,
and Churchill are all, in some sense, heroic poems. In the Discourse
Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire, after discussing the dis­
advantages of the burlesque metre chosen by Samuel Butler and after stat­
ing his own preference for satire such as Boileau's, written in the French
heroic measure, Dryden proceeds toward his final suggestions about the
requirements of the more "Noble kind of Satire": "Had I time, I cou'd
enlarge on the Beautiful Turns of Words and Thoughts; which are as req­
uisite in this, as in Heroique Poetry it self; of which this Satire is
undoubtedly a Species." So too Pope, especially in later works such
as the Epilogue to the Satires, presents satire as essentially heroic po­
etry, requiring powerful passions and Divine inspiration:

O sacred Weapon! left for Truth's defence,
Sole Dread of Folly, Vice, and Insolence!
To all but Heav'n-directed hands deny'd,
The Muse may give thee, but the Gods must guide.

(Dialogue II, 11. 212-15)

Churchill's poetry has a tendency toward declamation, toward "the high
oratorical style" associated with Juvenal and the sublime. Dryden,
Pope, and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Churchill, composed satire mainly
in heroic couplets. Goldsmith, who wrote his two "serious" poems in he-
ric couplets, chose a "low" metrical form, the anapaestic couplet, for Retaliation. The major satires of Dryden, Pope, and Churchill are all public poems, at least in terms of intended audience, whereas Retaliation was written for a group of friends.

Although Retaliation may not answer in many respects to modern definitions of satire, Goldsmith, I think, would have considered his comic poem as a type of satire. It may be helpful here to glance at the eighteenth-century distinction between Horatian and Juvenalian satire. Dryden thought that Horace wrote most of his satires in the "low" style: "The low style of Horace, is according to his Subject; that is generally groveling." Juvenal's satires, on the other hand, are more elevated: "His Expressions are Sonorous and more Noble; his Verse more numerous, and his Words are suitable to his Thoughts; sublime and lofty." Joseph Trapp distinguishes similarly between Horatian (or "jocose") and Juvenalian (or "serious") satire: "... The Foibles of Mankind are the Object of the one; greater Crimes, of the other: The former is always in the low Style; the latter generally in the Sublime: That abounds with Wit only; this adds to the Salt Bitterness and Acrimony." Turning to modern English writers, Trapp remarks that "the Horatian Satire is little affected among us," a significant comment, though, of course, delivered some years before Pope composed his Horatian Imitations or Young his Love of Fame, The Universal Passion. In the preface to those satires, Young states his preference for the "laughing satire" of Horace:

This kind of satire only has any delicacy in it. Of this delicacy Horace is the best master: he appears in good humour while he censures; and therefore his censure has the more weight, as supposed to proceed from judgment, not from passion. Juvenal is ever in a passion. ... Furthermore, eighteenth-century satirists "liked to repeat Horace's modest
avowal that he wrote for his own pleasure and that of a few close friends.\textsuperscript{69} It is clear that many eighteenth-century commentators on satire recognized two types, and it is probable that these commentators accentuated the differences between Horace and Juvenal to make them appear to be polar opposites. In the spectrum between these poles, Goldsmith's Retaliation lies very near the extreme of "laughing" satire, which has the characteristics of low style, emphasis on foibles instead of crimes, a good-humoured magnanimous poet, and an audience of a few close friends. Pope, perhaps in his \textit{Imitations of Horace}, and certainly in "original" poems such as the \textit{Epilogue to the Satires}, would have liked to have been praised for the qualities which Trapp praised in Boileau: Boileau "has so happily blended Horace and Juvenal together, that he seems to have found out a beautiful Species of Satire between both."\textsuperscript{70} Modern critics have noted how Pope combines the colloquial mode of Horace and the heroic mode of Juvenal.\textsuperscript{71}

In one of the best accounts of Goldsmith's ideas on comedy, Ricardo Quintana observes that Goldsmith "never lost sight of the satiric aspect."\textsuperscript{72} The kind of comic satire which I have found in Goldsmith's final poem is similar to that which Goldsmith praises in one of his earliest statements on satire, that in a favourable comment on Mr. Town of the periodical \textit{The Connoisseur}: "He is the first Writer since Bickerstaff, who has been perfectly satyrical, yet perfectly good-natured; and who never, for the sake of declamation, represents simple folly as absolutely criminal" (I, 14). Here, Goldsmith aligns himself with good-natured Horatian satire rather than declamatory Juvenalian satire. Goldsmith, neither "benevolist" nor "Augustan," was formed as much through the influence of the periodical essays of Addison and Steele, whose Bickerstaff he praises, as through the poems of Swift and Pope. Goldsmith quotes approvingly from the \textit{Connoisseur}, No. LXXI, sentiments on "laughing" satire that are very similar
to Young's: "In a word, upon all occasions I have endeavoured to laugh people into a better behaviour: as I am convinced that the sting of reproof is not less sharp for being concealed; and advice never comes with a better face, than when it comes with a laughing one" (I, 15). Such is very much Goldsmith's own view on comedy and satire—and, like Samuel Butler, he scarcely distinguishes between the two. Goldsmith is a comic writer essentially because, for him, comedy provided the most realistic picture of life: "humour, in writing, chiefly consists in an imitation of the foibles or absurdities of mankind. . ." (I, 84). Humour is most difficult to obtain (I, 204), but, as he says in the "Memoirs of M. de Voltaire," "[n]o satire strikes deeper than humour when particularly applied. . ." (III, 271). While no doubt Goldsmith's preference for comic writing is deeply rooted in his personality, his critical remarks on comedy and satire concern the effectiveness of these in combatting folly. Young's Satires, for Goldsmith, do not succeed as well as they might, because Young "seems fonder of dazzling than pleasing; of raising our admiration for his wit, than our dislike of the follies he ridicules" (V, 328). The moral and judicial functions of satire are by no means dead in Goldsmith's works, though in Retaliation they are subordinate to his intention to amuse. James Prior's high estimation of Retaliation, though not perhaps just in all its particulars, does seem particularly apt in the comparison of Goldsmith to Horace, at least given the way Horace was viewed by commentators like Dryden, Trapp, and Young:

But to be at once searching and accurate, to individualize the man from his species, to unveil foibles without violently shocking self-love, and while probing them to inflict no pain; to be faithful yet friendly, witty and discreet; to exhibit minute delicacy of touch, with perfect truth in the painting so that all the world shall see the likeness without the original having cause for reasonable offence in the display of his imperfections, is one of those happinesses that high genius alone can
hope to accomplish, and this Goldsmith has done. . . . The same felicitous qualities exhibited in a somewhat different manner, have given Horace a reputation that no time is likely to impair.74

"The satiric image," writes Ronald Paulson, "lacks the complete abstraction of the comic: a certain disgust, a certain physical involvement of the reader is always necessary." 75 In the modern view, as represented by Paulson's statement, there is little satire in Goldsmith's Retaliation. Thus, while I have classified Retaliation as a "laughing" or Horatian satire, I am aware that the poem in modern terms, even though it shares with satire the device of the literary portrait, might be more accurately called comic than satiric. The poem largely lacks the physical involvement, the depiction of evil, and the sense of urgency that most modern readers consider the essential qualities of satire. Thus, it is in one way quite just to include Retaliation as a pertinent work when considering the decline of verse satire in mid-eighteenth-century England. In my survey of this subject, I have argued that Goldsmith and his contemporaries should be viewed as complex individuals, not as men who fall "clearly" into one tradition or another. Therefore, I have for the most part avoided one of the readiest explanations for the decline of the satiric spirit—the rise of sentimentalism. I have scarcely touched upon what seems to be a very fruitful area of discussion—the changing poet–audience relationship that came about with the growth of the reading public—primarily because it is an area that has little application to Goldsmith's Retaliation, given the intended audience for the poem. I have mentioned the political and topical orientation of much of the best verse satire in the eighteenth century, and I have suggested that Goldsmith's apparent desire to avoid topical subjects and partisan politics in his poetry may have been a factor in his decision not to attempt a major verse satire prior to Retaliation. Changes in the hierarchy of poetical genres
are of considerable importance in the decline of verse satire, and the shift toward the lyric appears to have had some effect on the nature of Goldsmith's *Traveller* and *Deserted Village*. The supreme achievements of Dryden, Swift, and Pope did not make it easier for a late eighteenth-century author to write original and vital satire. The development of biography and the novel, with the attendant interest in psychology and balanced character portrayal, contributed to the decline of satire and, particularly, of the satiric portrait. Although it would be wrong to suggest that Swift and Pope had no interest in exploring the motives of evil men, nevertheless a change in emphasis may be observed from the predominantly moral vision of the satirist to the biographer's and novelist's concern with personality. The growing acceptance of particular details as valuable in themselves in character portrayal and, especially, in natural description was opposed by Goldsmith in his critical remarks. I have tried to demonstrate that compassion plays a limited but essential role in the satires of Pope, and suggested that when compassion takes a leading role or when it never appears at all Popean satire can no longer be written. Self-portrayal is the particular quality of Pope's formal verse satires that later satirists chose especially to extend and transform. For this reason, and because self-portrayal is the central critical question for Goldsmith's poetry, I have considered self-portraiture in some detail. In the poems examined, from Pope, Churchill, and Goldsmith, the self-portrait of the satirist appears to change from that of a man of virtue, to that of an erring but conscientious man, to that of a man treated with such irony that he becomes indistinguishable from the satiric targets in the poem. There seems to be a progressive deterioration of the self-portrait as a satiric norm in verse satire. In *Retaliation* self-portrayal does not provide a satiric norm in any sense. The
norms that there are must largely be discovered in the web of contrasting faults and virtues that joins the several epitaphs and unifies the poem. These contrasts will constitute, in part, the subject of my final chapter, but brief attention must first be given to the tradition of the anapaestic tetrameter couplet, the "low" metrical form that Goldsmith chose for Retaliation.
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Chapter II: Retaliation and the Anapaestic Tetrameter Couplet

from Prior to Goldsmith

"Excuse any more—for I very well know/Both my subject and verse—is exceedingly low..."¹ So Simkin Blunderhead writes to his mother in Christopher Anstey's New Bath Guide (1766). In this chapter I shall examine the "low" verse form common to The New Bath Guide and Retaliation—the anapaestic tetrameter couplet—by sketching the tradition of poems composed in this verse form from Matthew Prior to Oliver Goldsmith. Continuous anapaests in poetry before Prior were largely confined to songs and ballads, and usually popular rather than literary songs. While the employment of anapaests for popular and musical purposes continued unabated during the eighteenth century, Prior made trisyllabic metres available to literary poets for a greater range of purposes.² The four-stress line, to which I shall limit my discussion, is the anapaest's "most natural arrangement in English."³ Although the anapaestic tetrameter couplet is not common, other than in songs and ballads, in the period from Prior to Goldsmith, there are sufficient examples to constitute a tradition. As might be expected when dealing with a "low" verse form, few of the poems in the tradition are among the major poems of the authors represented. Only in the works of minor poets such as Byrom and Anstey is the anapaestic tetrameter couplet a dominant form. In selecting the poems to be discussed, I shall try to give some indication of the wide range of genres for which this metrical form has been used. At the same time, since I am sketching the tradition in which Retaliation lies, I shall devote particular attention to epitaphs and epigrams, as well as to ballads and verse.
epistles when these contain significant character-sketches. The anapaestic couplet in this period is essentially a medium for light verse, and many of the poems have an equal, some a better, claim to satire than does Goldsmith's Retaliation. Another criterion, then, will be to select poems that resemble Goldsmith's in structure, diction, or intention. In this discussion of the various poets who have written in the anapaestic tetrameter couplet, I shall endeavour to illustrate its characteristics and suggest why Goldsmith used it for Retaliation.

Goldsmith learned the art of the heroic couplet mainly from Dryden, Pope, and Johnson. For the octosyllabic verse tale and the anapaestic familiar epistle and light satire Goldsmith had other masters, most notably Prior and Swift. Prior's poems in anapaest include epitaphs and epigrams, ballads, and translations. What is probably Prior's earliest attempt in anapaestic tetrameter couplets, a satire composed in 1688, looks back to an earlier poem in this metre as much as it looks forward to the eighteenth century. Prior's Session of the Poets, not published until the twentieth century, is an imitation of the Session of the Poets first published in Rochester's Poems on Several Occasions in 1680 and now thought to be possibly by Elkanah Settle. Both Sessions have the portrait-gallery structure of Pope's Epistle to a Lady or Goldsmith's Retaliation, though only in Pope is the painting metaphor developed. In both Sessions the "Sons of the Muses" gather before Apollo to state their qualifications for the laureateship. Each verse paragraph is essentially a satiric portrait comprised partly of a description of a poet and partly of Apollo's dismissal of that poet's claims. Two passages will illustrate the differences between the two poems. I have chosen the portrait of Nathaniel Lee from the 1680 Session and that of John Dryden from Prior:
N[at] L[ee], stept in next in hopes of a Prize, Apollo, remember'd he had hit once in Thrice; By the Rubyes in's Face, he cou'd not deny, But he had as much Wit, as Wine cou'd supply; Confest that indeed he had a Musical Note, But sometimes strain'd so hard he rattled i'th' Throat, Yet owning he had Sense, t'encourage him for't, He made him his Ovid in Augustus's Court. (ll. 37-44)

John Dryden appear'd at the head of the Gang, And with a low bow and learned Harangue He said with Submission he thought t'wou'd be hard If he of the Bays shou'd at length be debar'd Who so well had writ and so frankly declar'd. Declaring says Phoebus, concerns not this court; They that set you at work let 'em e'en pay you for't. What's Religion to Us, tis well known that many Have manag'd the Place well without having Any For matter of Writing 'tis frankly confess If we'll take your bare word for't You do it much best. (ll. 9-19)

It is immediately apparent that Prior, even in an early poem not polished for publication, brings a greater smoothness to the anapaestic line. Prior has no lines, like "Confest that indeed he had a Musical Note, But sometimes strain'd so hard he rattled i'th' Throat," which seem to defy scansion. In place of the reported speech of Apollo in 1680, Prior's livelier verses present Apollo's speech in dialogue form. Realistic reproduction of conversation, extended by Prior in his imitation of the earlier Session, plays an important part in many of the anapaestic poems that followed in the course of the eighteenth century.

Prior's two ballads in anapaestic couplets, both written to the tune of "King John and the Abbot of Canterbury," display the same interest in dialogue. In "The Thief and the Cordelier," a slight tale of a priest's comforting of a man at the gallows, the dialogue not only sounds very natural in the anapaestic metre but serves well to delineate character:

What frightens You thus, my good Son? says the Priest: You Murther'd, are Sorry, and have been Confest.
O Father! My Sorrow will scarce save my Bacon:
For 'twas not that I Murther'd, but that I was Taken.
(ll. 26-29)

It is to poetry of this kind that we must turn in order to discover the kind of colloquial language that Goldsmith uses in Retaliation. The second ballad, Down-Hall, is more autobiographical, more delightful, and even better than "The Thief and the Cordelier" in terms of depiction of character and description of scene. The poem is about Matthew Prior himself, who wishes to purchase a country house, and his friend John Morley, who wishes to sell him one:

VII.

And now in this Journey of Life I wou'd have
A Place where to bait, 'twixt the Court and the Grave;
Where joyful to Live, not unwilling to Dye.
Gadzooks, I have just such a Place in my Eye.
(ll. 26-29)

This is very fine light verse, indeed. How excellently Prior controls the mood, moving from Matthew's "Dye" to John's "Gadzooks," an appropriate word for the first one that John speaks in the poem since it characterizes his speech throughout (see ll. 33, 145). The entire poem is imbued with the mixture of sadness and humour that is found in this stanza. The poem in fact presents a little "Journey of Life," through enumerating the changes that time has wrought since Morley last visited the inns on the road between London and Down-Hall. Prior captures beautifully the simple speech of the Landlady at the Sign of the Bull:

XVIII.

Why now let me Die, Sir, or live upon Trust.
If I know to which Question to answer you first;
Why Things since I saw you most strangely have vari'd;
The Hostler is hang'd, and the Widow is marry'd.
XIX.
And PRUE left a Child for the Parish to Nurse,
And SISLEY went off with a Gentlemans Purse;
And as to my Sister, so mild, and so Dear,
She has lain in the Church-yard full many a Year.
(11. 70-77)

Oswald Doughty comments on Prior's description:

Into this small eighteenth-century inn, Prior has compressed
the whole of life. Here are its mingled pathos and humour, its
gaiety and sorrow, its unconscious ironies. In the cantering
anapaests that sweep the travellers along, we seem to hear the
beating of the rhythm of life itself. Through all there is the
sense of this headlong flight that stays not for the remarried
widow, the hanged ostler, the deserted child, or the 'mild and
dear' sister who lies sleeping in the churchyard, remote from
the tumult of life.

It is not necessary to go as far into the history of the anapaestic cou­
plet as, say, William Blake's "The Chimney Sweeper" in the Songs of Inno­
cence to discover the emotional range which this instrument can reach in
the hands of a master.

The anapaestic tetrameter couplet appears to place a distant second
or third behind the predominant heroic couplet as the verse form most
frequently chosen by eighteenth-century epigrammatists. To mention only
important authors, Prior, Swift, Pope, Gray, Smart, and Fielding composed
epigrams using this verse form. The relevance of this genre to Retalia­
tion is clear, for the epitaph and mock-epitaph are included in the epi­
gram kind. That the epigram was usually placed at the bottom of the hier­
archy of genres—and thus a low verse form was well suited to it—did not
mean that such poems should not be finely wrought. Quite the reverse is
true, for the origins of epigrams in inscriptions on monuments, urns,
and tombs were not yet forgotten in the eighteenth century. In fact,
the age was continually reminded of the lapidary nature of epigram by the
excavations of Greek and Roman ruins. Nevertheless, in a period when
many writers felt that various mock-genres could approximate more closely the truth of human experience than could conventional use of classical genres and when man's follies and vices were thought to offer more abundant fruit in the literary harvest than his virtues, it is not surprising that the mock-epitaph and the satirical epigram flourished. Prior is one of the century's best writers of epigrams and epitaphs, and a significant number of these are in anapaestic tetrameter lines. The following is a mock-epitaph on Francis Atterbury, occasioned by a legal dispute between Atterbury and Dr. Robert Freind on the location of a new dormitory at Westminster School:

MEEK Franco lyes here, Friend, without stop or stay
    As You value your Peace; make the best of your way.
  Th6 arrested at present by Deaths catif claw
    If He stirs, He may yet have recourse to the Law:
    And in the Kings Bench shou'd a Verdict be found
      That by Livery and Seisin his Grave is his ground;
    He may claim to himself what is strictly his due,
    And an Action of Trespass will straitway ensue,
      That You without right on His premisses tread,
    On a single Surmise that the Owner is dead. 

(I, 549)

The clever play in the opening couplet on the "Stay Traveller" motif of classical epitaphs and the depiction of Atterbury as a litigious man who, frighteningly, carries this character even into the grave give the epitaph satiric point. Two of Prior's best poems are epitaphs in anapaestic tetrameter lines, though neither has couplet rhyme. "Jinny the Just" is written in triplets, and "For His Own Epitaph" in alternately rhymed quatrains. "Jinny the Just" is not a mock-epitaph, but rather an epitaph on a woman of low degree: "For Her Sirname and race let the Heraults e'n answer,/Her own proper worth was enough to advance Her,/And He who lik'd Her little valu'd her Grandsire" (I. 31-33). Although the poem was not published until the twentieth century, it was perhaps not without influ-
ence in the eighteenth: "Pope and Swift read the poem in manuscript, and liked it so much that they asked permission [of Lord Oxford, after Prior's death] to print it in their Miscellanies. . . ." Prior's "For His Own Epitaph" illustrates the attraction for the eighteenth-century author to compose verses for his own death. Prior, himself, wrote another such poem, "For My Own Tomb-stone" (I. 466). Pope, a prolific writer of heroic couplet epitaphs, wrote his "Epitaph: On Himself" in anapaestic tetrameter:

Under this Marble, or under this Sill,
Or under this Turf, or e'en what they will;
Whatever an Heir, or a Friend in his stead,
Or any good Creature shall lay o'er my Head;
Lies He who ne'er car'd, and still cares not a Pin,
What they said, or may say of the Mortal within.
But who living and dying, serene still and free,
Trusts in God, that as well as he was, he shall be.

(p. 827)

His own character, as Pope presents it here, does not much differ from that which he presents in his satires, though perhaps such a phrase as "cares not a Pin" is better suited to the anapaestic than to the heroic line.

The same impulse which lies behind Prior's and Pope's lapidary verses on themselves, as well as Gay's "My Own Epitaph," appears in somewhat disguised form in the Elegy Written in a Country Church-Yard and motivates the epitaph-writing contest that led to Retaliation. More interesting than the Elegy for my purposes are the occasions on which Gray turned to the anapaestic tetrameter couplet. Thomas Warton preserved these:

one day the Bishop having offered to give a Gentleman a Goose
Mr Gr<ay> composed his Epitaph, thus.

Here lies Edmund Keene Lord Bishop of Chester,
He eat a fat goose, and could not digest her—

And this upon his Lady—
Here lies Mrs Keene the Bishop of Chester,
She had a bad face which did sadly molest her.
(p. 85)11

As Pope stands outside society to criticize it in the Epilogue to the Satires, so Gray when he sketched his own character in 1761 justifies his withdrawal from society through hitting satiric targets both general and particular:

Too poor for a bribe, and too proud to importune;
He had not the method of making a fortune:
Could love and could hate, so was thought somewhat odd;
NO VERY GREAT WIT, HE BELIEV'D IN A GOD:
A Post or a Pension he did not desire,
But left Church and State to Charles Townshend and Squire.
(p. 72)

Gray stands in opposition to a society in which only the unscrupulous (like Townshend) and the obsequious (like Squire) are rewarded, in which human emotions are equated with oddity, and wit with godlessness. Gray's "[Sketch of His Own Character]," in which Austin Dobson finds a resemblance to Goldsmith's portrait of Edmund Burke,12 is less comic than most anapaestic satires and less colloquial even than Pope's unsmiling "Epitaph: On Himself," much less the anapaests of Prior. Gray, of course, was capable of the more colloquial anapaest, as he demonstrates in The Candidate.

Swift is probably the most important and most influential writer of anapaests in the eighteenth century. Among his three dozen or so poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets are many in the colloquial style. While Swift is primarily known for his poems in octosyllabic couplets, "in such pieces as The Grand Question Debated he discovered, along with his contemporary Matthew Prior, new resources in the anapaestic variation."13 Epigrams, character-sketches, songs, ballads, riddles, and familiar epistles are among the kinds of poems that Swift wrote in anapaests. Further
cause for treating Swift's anapaestic couplets at some length is found in the fact that Goldsmith appears to have recalled lines from *The Grand Question Debated* when composing *The Haunch of Venison* and *Retaliation*.\(^{14}\)

Most of Swift's epigrams in anapaestic couplets might well be called lampoons. The following is an epigram on Bishop Josiah Hort's obsequious behaviour before the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland:

*LOrd Pam in the Church (cou'd you think it) kneel'd down,*  
When told the Lieutenant was just come to Town,  
His Station despising, unaw'd by the Place,  
He flies from his *God*, to attend on his *Grace:*  
To the *Court* it was fitter to pay his *Devotion,*  
Since *God* had no *Hand* in his Lordship's *Promotion.*  

(III, 809)\(^{15}\)

Here, as is frequently the case, the epigram constitutes a character-sketch. The effect of this epigram depends little on the low diction and conversational style characteristic of the anapaestic couplet. Only in the parenthetical remark in the first line is there a strong impression of conversation. The techniques that Swift uses in this epigram are rather those usually associated with the heroic couplet. The second line of each couplet serves to undermine the first, and effective use is made of parallelism and antithesis. The low verse form, however, may have the effect of belittling the subject, rendering a Bishop Hort as insignificant as the usual low subject of satirical epigrams. The name "Lord Pam" likewise serves a depreciatory function. While Dryden and Pope typify their best-known targets by means of Biblical or classical names, Swift draws the name of his target from a more vulgar source—the card-game Loo. The anapaestic couplet as it is used here is similar to the antithetical couplets in Goldsmith's sketch of Burke, though Swift's intention is much more unequivocally satirical. In "Advice to a Parson: An Epigram" (III, 807-08) and "An Epigram, Inscribed to the Honourable Sergeant Kite" (III,
Swift employs the anapaestic couplet in much the same way that he does in the lines on "Lord Pam." An example in Swift of an epigram in which the low verse form is matched by the lowness of its subject is that which begins "As Thomas was cudgelld one day by his Wife" (I, 327).

Two poems which are not called epigrams, but which are closely related to the epigram kind, are "The Character of Sir Robert Walpole" (II, 539-40) and "A Portrait from the Life" (III, 954-55). The eighteenth-century epigram, as I have noted, is frequently a character-sketch. The epitaph or mock-epitaph almost invariably consists of a brief Character. In fact, the literary portrait as it is used by Dryden, Pope, Swift, and other eighteenth-century poets, can be seen to have its origins in two seventeenth-century forms: the epigram, especially as composed by Ben Jonson, and the Theophrastan Character. The couplets in "The Character of Sir Robert Walpole" are again marked by parallelism and antithesis:

With favour & fortune fastidiously blest
he's loud in his laugh & he's coarse in his Jest
of favour & fortune unmerited vain
a sharper in trifles a dupe in the main
atchieving of nothing Still promising wonders
by dint of experience improving in Blunders
oppressing true merit exalting the base
and selling his Country to purchase his peace
a Jobber of Stocks by retailing false news
a prater at Court in the Stile of the Stews
of Virtue & worth by profession a giber
of Juries & senates the bully & briber
Tho I name not the wretch you know who I mean
T'is the Cur dog of Brittain & spaniel of Spain.

The antitheses in these lines are manifold: "atchieving" and "promising," "oppressing" and "exalting," "selling" and "purchasing." (Present participles are, of course, characteristic of anapaestic lines.) A knave in trivial matters, Walpole is basically a fool. His experience of the world, according to Swift, only renders him more foolish and less capable of governing. The repetition of commercial terms—such as "selling,"
"purchase," and "retailing"—implies that for Walpole everything is a commercial transaction: even "peace" must be bought. (The opposition attributed to Walpole the political maxim "All men have their price."\textsuperscript{17} Another characteristic of these couplets, again one commonly encountered in heroic couplets, is inversion. Here prepositional phrases precede rather than follow the nouns and adjectives by which they are governed. By this means, terms of opprobrium like "vain" and "briber" are placed in the strong positions at the ends of lines. Moreover, the second halves of lines frequently serve to deflate the first: "of Virtue & worth by profession a giber." The alliteration in these lines is insistent and contemptuous: "to purchase his peace," "in the Stile of the Stews," "the bully & briber," "& spaniel of Spain." Animal imagery, worthy of remark in the final line of the sketch of Walpole, dominates "A Portrait from the Life":

COME sit by my side, while this picture I draw:  
In chattering a magpie, in pride a jackdaw;  
A temper the Devil himself could not bridle,  
Impertinent mixture of busy and idle.  
As rude as a bear, no mule half so crabbed;  
She swills like a sow, and she breeds like a rabbit:  
A house-wife in bed, at table a slattern;  
For all an example, for no one a pattern.  
Now tell me, friend Thomas, Ford, Grattan, and merry Dan,  
Has this any likeness to good Madam Sheridan?

Although neither the portrait of Walpole nor of Mrs. Sheridan is sympathetic, there is a considerable difference between the two sketches. The poem on Walpole is far removed from speech, such being not the least of the effects of inversion in the poem. "A Portrait from the Life" is much more colloquial, especially in the opening line and the closing couplet, in which Swift speaks directly to the friends who constitute his audience.

Many of Swift's poems in anapaests are slight, occasional pieces.
In fact, many are to be found in the hundred pages of "Riddles" and "Trifles" at the end of Harold Williams's edition of Swift's poetry. Swift and his friends wrote poetry of various kinds for diversion. Three of the riddles in Swift are in anapaestic tetrameter couplets (III, 927, 928-29, 937-38). The riddle had already been written in this metrical form by Prior, and his "Enigma" is more successful than any of the anapaestic riddles in Swift:

BY Birth I'm a Slave, yet can give you a Crown;  
I dispose of all Honours, my self having none;  
I'm obliged by just Maxims to govern my Life,  
Yet I hang my own Master, and lye with his Wife.  
Where Men are a Gaming, I cunningly sneak,  
And their Cudgels and Shovels away from 'em take.  
Fair Maidens and Ladies I by the Hand get,  
And pick off their Diamonds, tho' ne're so well set;  
But when I have Comrades, we rob in whole Bands,  
Then we presently take off your Lands from your Hands;  
But this fury once over, I've such winning Arts,  
That you love me much more than you doe your own Hearts.  
(I, 124)

The solution to the "enigma," as Wright and Spears indicate in their Commentary on the poem, is the knave of clubs, or "Pam" in the game of Loo (II, 865). As with most similar productions, Prior's "Enigma" depends for its effectiveness on a species of what some would have called "false wit," in this case, word-plays on the names of the four suits in cards. Here, however, the word-plays seem truly witty: ladies lose precious jewels through gambling at Loo, as well as they do the "Diamonds" in the deck of cards. Likewise, there seems to be some ambivalence of subject between an actual knave and the knave of clubs. And the final line remains quite ominous even when the "enigma" has been solved. The anapaestic tetrameter couplet was the metrical form chosen for such ventures into false wit as Esther Vanhomrigh's rebus on Swift. Swift's answer, interesting for its depreciatory self-presentation, discusses the nature of the
Later in the century other "corruptions of verse" were found to be compatible with the anapaestic tetrameter couplet. Here is a work by John Cunningham "On so mean a Design" (Swift, II, 716) as an acrostic and so hackneyed a subject as a comparison of a mortal beauty to Venus:

PRAY tell me, says Venus, one day to the Graces,  
(On a visit they came, and had just ta'en their places)  
Let me know why of late I can ne'er see your faces:  
Ladies, nothing, I hope, happen'd here to affright ye:  
You've had compliment cards every day to invite ye.  

Says Cupid, who guess'd their rebellious proceeding,  
"Underhand, dear mamma, there's some mischief a-breeding:  
"There's a fair one at Lincoln, so finish'd a beauty,  
"That your loves and your graces all swerve from "their duty."  
On my life, says dame Venus, I'll not thus be put on,  
Now I think on't, last night, some one call'd me Miss Sutton.  
(p. 226) 18

Cunningham's acrostic is not, in fact, without merit. Venus' speech is a pleasant imitation of the speech of the fine ladies of the day. Such details as "compliment cards" lend vitality to what otherwise would be a dull panegyric.

The familiar verse epistle in anapaestic couplets appears to have its origins with Swift and his circle. The verse epistle in this metrical form appealed to several subsequent writers in the eighteenth century, including John Byrom, Thomas Lisle, Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, Richard Owen Cambridge, Anstey, and Goldsmith. Some of the earliest verses of this kind are those sent by the members of the Scriblerus Club inviting the Earl of Oxford to their meetings:
Tho the Dean has run from us in manner uncivil;
The Doctor, and He that's nam'd next to the Devil,
With Gay, who Petition'd you once on a time,
And Parnell, that would, if he had but a Rhyme.
(That Gay the poor Sec: and that arch Chaplain Parnell,
As Spiritual one, as the other is Carnal),
Forgetting their Interest, now humbly sollicit
You'd at present do nothing but give us a Visit.
(The Poems of Alexander Pope, p. 286)

Although these collaborative verses were written in Swift's absence, others in anapaestic couplets were written at about the same time (c. 1713) when Swift was one of the company. These verses reveal some of the common territory between the Hudibrastic tradition and the anapaestic couplet tradition. In both metrical forms, poets used feminine rhymes and triple rhymes liberally, primarily for comic effect. In this brief verse letter, the "Parnell/Carnal" rhyme is a typical example. Such rhymes are uncommon in heroic couplet verse, except in light verse such as prologues and epilogues. John Dryden comments on rhyme in his qualified praise of Samuel Butler and Hudibras:

the double Rhyme, (a necessary Companion of Burlesque Writing) is not so proper for Manly Satire, for it turns Earnest too much to Jest, and gives us a Boyish kind of Pleasure. It tickles awkwardly with a kind of pain, to the best sort of Readers; we are pleas'd ungratefully, and, if I may say so, against our liking. We thank him not for giving us that unseasonable Delight, when we know he cou'd have given us a better, and more solid. He might have left that Task to others, who not being able to put in Thought, can only make us grin with the Excresence of a Word of two or three Syllables in the Close.19

In the major satires of Dryden and Pope feminine rhymes are rare; in works of lower style, such as Pope's anapaestic "Epitaph (of By-Words)," even triple rhymes are encountered: "For the Dame, by her Skill in Affairs Astronomical, Imagin'd, to live in the Clouds was but comical" (p. 817). Ingenious rhymes, however, are more characteristic of Swift than Pope. In her fine book on Swift, Nora Crow Jaffe states that in his poetic games
with his friends, "Swift regarded rhyme, in particular, as his forte," and he "cultivated the talent until it approached Butler's." In one of Swift's "Trifles," in octosyllabics, he sets himself the task of finding rhymes for the names of classical authors (III, 987-89). In another, Swift responds to Thomas Sheridan's verse letter of thirteen anapaestic tetrameter lines all rhyming with "drain" with a poem of thirty-four lines all rhyming with "Wine":

The Verses you sent on the bottling your Wine  
Were in evry ones Judgment exceedingly fine,  
And I must confess as a Dean and Divine  
I think you inspird by the Muses all nine...  

(III, 1017)

And in two verse epistles dated 23 November 1731, Swift wrote thirty-three anapaestic tetrameter lines, all having the same rhyme:

To Doctor Sheridan

IF I write any more, it will make my poor Muse sick.  
This Night I came home with a very cold Dew sick,  
And I wish I may soon be not of an A-gue sick;  
But, I hope I shall ne'er be, like you, of a Shrew sick,  
Who often has made me, by looking ascue, sick.  

(III, 1030)

Although Goldsmith never seems to have had occasion to play rhyming games such as these, the influence of Swift on his poems in octosyllabics and anapaests is apparent. Occasionally Goldsmith even borrows a striking rhyme from Swift. Very appropriately this couplet from "A New Simile: In the Manner of Swift"—"Till reading, I forget what day on/A chapter out of Took's Pantheon" (ll. 5-6)——echoes a couplet from one of Swift's Market Hill poems, "My Lady's Lamentation and Complaint Against the Dean": "And pore ev'ry day on/That nasty Pantheon" (ll. 149-50). Double and triple rhymes are characteristic of light verse because they are often
inherently funny, but also because in light verse the poet frequently makes
a show of the artifice that he seeks to conceal in his more serious verse.
Therefore, in light verse, "[t]he rhymes are ingenious, perhaps outrageous.
The rhythms are assertive, either excessively regular or excessively ir-
regular; unusual metric schemes become prominent." It is only in light
verse that anapaestic tetrameter may be said to have gained any real prom-
inence in the eighteenth century.

Swift's "Riddles" and "Trifles" are of interest primarily because
they reveal a side of a great writer that is seldom exposed—the man di-
verting himself with his friends. These poems help to fill in the picture
of Swift as a poet: "The excremental poems and the poems to Stella rep-
resent the extremes of Swift's style. His poems to and for his friends
show him in a more typical mood." For my purposes, these poems have
also been important for Swift's experiments with humorous effects in the
anapaestic tetrameter line. The "Riddles" and "Trifles" do not, however,
hold much interest as poems. Among Swift's verses in anapaestic couplets,
several hold substantial interest as poetry. Three of these—A Serious
are indignant personal assaults that have little in common with later
eighteenth-century anapaestic satires like The New Bath Guide or Retalia-
tion. A Serious Poem upon William Wood ends with Swift's anticipation
that Wood will hang; "Wood, an Insect," with the anticipation that Wood
will be scalded in "his own melted Copper" (l. 36) or boiled "in a Caul-
dron of Oyl" (l. 38). The worst punishment Anstey affords his satiric
victims is to have departing physicians bombarded with their own medicines
from the window of a house (The New Bath Guide, "Letter IV"). Swift's
"Place of the Damn'd" is likewise satiric, though here the satire is gen-
eral rather than personal. In this poem, as in Gulliver's fourth voyage,
our world becomes a kind of hell, and those who deny it to be so are complacent optimists: "And HELL to be sure is at Paris or Rome, How happy for Us, that it is not at Home" (II, 576). Except that his focus is more on society than individual psychology, Swift offers a view of the world not much different from that offered by existentialists and absurdists.

The poem which, while it is interesting in itself, is most directly related to later productions in anapaests, especially Goldsmith’s, is The Grand Question Debated: Whether Hamilton’s Bawn Should Be Turned into a Barrack or a Malt-House. In this poem Swift rallies friends rather than rails at enemies. The depreciatory self-portrait is filtered through a complex structure of points of view. Swift here employs the kind of obvious irony that Martin S. Day believes was Christopher Anstey’s contribution to anapaestic satire. Once Sir Arthur Acheson has argued that the “Bawn” should be made a “Malt-House,” Lady Acheson offers her side of the argument, the verbal irony in the first few lines being emphasized by the use of italics:

THUS ended the Knight: Thus began his meek Wife:
It must, and it shall be a Barrack, my Life.
I'm grown a meer Mopus; no Company comes;
But a Rabble of Tenants, and rusty dull Rumms;
With Parsons, what Lady can keep herself clean?
I'm all over dawb'd when I sit by the Dean.
But, if you will give us a Barrack, my Dear,
The Captain, I'm sure, will always come here;
I then shall not value his Deanship a Straw,
For the Captain, I warrant, will keep him in Awe;
Or should he pretend to be brisk and alert,
Will tell him that Chaplains should not be so pert;
That Men of his Coat should be minding their Prayers,
And not among Ladies to give themselves Airs.
(11. 25-38)

Similar to the verbal irony on "meek" is that involved in the fact that the person of the lowest social standing in the poem, Hannah the maid, is unable to "endure so vulgar a Taste" (1. 42) as that which would make
Sir Arthur a "Malster" (l. 45). The poem is narrated dramatically, and the Dean is just one among the characters (see l. 180). A further distancing of the self-portrait is effected because most of what we hear about Swift is from the point of view of other people, such as Lady Acheson, Hannah, or, still another step removed, the Captain in Hannah's fantasy about the result of a Barrack's being located at Hamilton's Bawn. Maurice Johnson remarks that many of Swift's "deservedly famous poems are self-dramatizations of personality, depicting Jonathan Swift not only in the ways he looked to himself but as he imagined he appeared to other eyes."25 Here are the witty reflections of Hannah's captain on Parsons, which were inspired by viewing the Dean's shabby dress:

"Whenever you see a Cassock and Gown,
"A Hundred to One, but it covers a Clown;
"Observe how a Parson comes into a Room,
"G— d— me, he hobbles as bad as my Groom;
"A Scholard, when just from his College broke loose,
"Can hardly tell how to cry Bo to a Goose;
"Your Noveds, and Blutraks, and Omurs and Stuff,
"By G— they don't signify this Pinch of Snuff.
"To give a young Gentleman right Education,
"The Army's the only good School in the Nation;
"My School-Master call'd me a Dunce and a Fool,
"But at Cuffs I was always the Cock of the School;
"I never cou'd take to my Book for the Blood o'me.
"And the Puppy confess'd, he expected no Good o'me.
"He caught me one Morning coquetting his Wife,
"But he maul'd me, I ne'er was so maul'd in my Life;
"So, I took to the Road, and what's very odd,
"The first Man I robb'd was a Parson by G—.
"Now Madam, you'll think it a strange Thing to say,
"But, the Sight of a Book makes me sick to this Day.

NEVER since I was born did I hear so much Wit,
And, Madam, I laugh'd till I thought I shou'd split.
(11. 153-74)

Again Hannah is the victim of Swift's obvious irony. What she calls the "Wit" of "a fine spoken Man" (l. 139) is shown to be nothing more than the oaths and narrow-minded sentiments of "a Dunce and a Fool." The characterization through dialogue of this rather typical eighteenth-century
Captain is brilliant. In fact, while *The Grand Question Debated* illustrates Swift's imaginative capacity for drawing a great deal from a minor debate, "the real merit of the poem lies rather in his conversational expertise." What Goldsmith learned about anapaestic dialogue from *The Grand Question Debated* can best be seen in *The Haunch of Venison*. The resemblance between "Your Novels, and Blutaraks, and Omurs and Stuff, / By G— they don't signify this Pinch of Snuff" and the final couplet of *Retaliation* has been remarked on by Goldsmith's editors.

The portrayal of the captain from Hannah's naive perspective has a great deal in common with the personages of Bath from Simkin Blunderhead's naive perspective. And perhaps *The Grand Question Debated* and *The New Bath Guide* present almost equal claims to the title of satire. Swift's poem would seem little entitled to be termed satiric if we accept Clive T. Probyn's suggestion that the poem is dramatic in motive as well as technique:

> there is no attempt here to evaluate experience, to give it didactic shape, to provide extrinsic reasons for its existence; there are no critical norms which can be transported into or out of the poem other than those for which it exists, the confrontation and creation through language of exuberant human comedy.

Probyn is quite right to use the word "comedy" in connection with *The Grand Question Debated*, but, as I have shown to be the case for Goldsmith, comedy for an eighteenth-century writer need not exclude evaluation, didacticism, or criticism of follies. Probyn is probably also right to state that there are no critical norms in the poem; however, such norms and a didactic intention may be found outside the poem. To evaluate the Captain, we may import into the poem a satiric tradition of bluff, plain-speaking Captains: a good example of one may be found in Pope's *Fourth Satire of Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Versified*, ll. 260-71.
For the didactic intention we may import into the poem such information as that Swift was an informal tutor to Lady Acheson, as it appears from "A Panegyric on the D—n, in the Person of a Lady in the North," ll. 129-54. Swift's didactic purpose in *The Grand Question Debated* is to rally Lady Acheson out of any apparent preference for the anti-intellectualism of the Captain over the learning of Parsons. To teach this simple lesson, Swift creates a Captain whose speech is littered with oaths, who admits to being a thief, and who is probably an adulterer. It is not unreasonable, I think, to import into the poem the relevant civil and religious laws that the Captain contravenes. *The Grand Question Debated* cannot be properly appreciated when it is viewed as a self-contained document. As Maurice Johnson argues, "[t]he moving events of Swift's life cannot be dissociated from his writings; as much as for any poet of his day, his own identity and his poetry seem inseparable." Swift's poetry has only recently begun to receive the critical attention it deserves, and this new attention can be seen as the direct result of the formulation of critical theories in opposition to those which posit that the literary work is a closed system.

Like many poets both before and after his time, Swift wrote songs and ballads in anapaestic tetrameter couplets. Swift has three poems of this description: *An Excellent New Song, Being the Intended Speech of a Famous Orator Against Peace* (I, 141-45), "The Yahoo's Overthrow; or, The Kevan Bayl's New Ballad, upon Serjeant Kite's Insulting the Dean" (III, 814-17), and "A Ballad" (III, 840-41). The most interesting of these, both in itself and for the purpose of studying the tradition of anapaestic verse leading to *Retaliation*, is "The Yahoo's Overthrow," since this poem contains a satiric portrait of the lawyer Richard Bettesworth. Two poems by friends of Swift—a song by Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Peterbor-
ough, and a related piece by Pope—are likewise interesting for the portraits they contain. In both of these the four-line stanza is the basic unit of portraiture. Both Peterborough's famous song "Chloe," addressed to Henrietta Howard, later Countess of Suffolk, and the related anapaests by Pope, published twice in 1969 from the manuscript in the Pierpoint Morgan Library, have the portrait-gallery structure which I remarked on in connection with Prior's *Session of the Poets*. The anapaestic couplet arranged in four-line stanzas had been combined with the portrait-gallery structure some fifty years before Peterborough's poem in Rochester's "Signior Dildo":

```
The Countess of Falmouth, of whom people tell
Her footmen wear shirts of a guinea an ell,
Might save the expense if she did but know
How lusty a swinger is Signior Dildo.

The Duchess of Modena, though she looks high,
With such a gallant is contented to lie,
And for fear the English her secrets should know,
For a Gentleman Usher took Signior Dildo.

The countess o' th' Cockpit (Who knows not her name?
She's famous in story for a killing dame),
When all her old lovers forsake her, I trow
She'll then be contented with Signior Dildo.
(11. 25-28, 37-44)
```

And so on through many of the famous or notorious women of Rochester's day. The Earl of Peterborough's "Chloe," composed of portraits of four nymphs, strikes a completely different note from the earlier Earl's "Signior Dildo." Part of the difference is, of course, to be explained by the reformation of manners that took place between the time Rochester's poem was composed (c. 1673) and the time Peterborough's poem was first published (1723). In Peterborough, the device of the refrain is gone, and while there is some criticism of his nymphs, a tone of lyric sweetness pervades...
the whole. Peterborough, or rather his heart, dismisses the first three nymths. Of Celia, he says, "Not the Beauty she has, nor the wit that she borrows, / Giveth the Eye any Joys, or the Heart any Sorrows" (p. 648). He is unmoved likewise by Sappho, and "Prudentia, as vainly too, puts in her Claim; / Ever gazing on Heaven, tho' Man is her Aim" (p. 648). The poem ends with two stanzas portraying the ideal woman—Chloe (Mrs. Howard).

Thus, in Peterborough we find an alteration of the portrait-gallery structure from that in "Signior Dildo" or A Session of the Poets. The portraits of inadequate persons are followed at the end of the poem by a portrait of the ideal. This procedure is the one followed by Pope in his anapaestic couplets on the characters of women as well as in the Epistle to a Lady and perhaps also by Goldsmith in Retaliation. Pope's anapaestic poem contains more portraits than Peterborough's, and the satire has been considerably heightenened. Pope presents another side of Cloe than Peterborough had:

Cloe's Tongue would be running, o'er Trust from her Eyes,  
More pert still than witty; more witty than wise;  
Good Nature (she vow'd) was the Thing she did scorn,  
Tho' but for Goodnature she ne'er could be born.

(p. 465)

The faults of Pope's Daphne are closer to those of Narcissa in the Epistle to a Lady than to anything in Peterborough's poem:

Daphne's Faith like an Ague, now chills and now burns,  
Freethinking and Bigotry rule her by turns,  
The Sin she lov'd well, but much dreaded the Smart,  
And was but a woeful good Christian at Heart.

(p. 465)

In fact, many of the anapaestic lines from this manuscript poem were revised as iambics and used again in "Sylvia, a Fragment" and the Epistle to a Lady. Such borrowing by Pope from himself has far-reaching conse-
quences for an assessment of Pope as a verse portraitist: "This is character-drawing by epigram rather than by analysis." While it seems highly unlikely that Goldsmith would have known Pope's anapaestic poem on the characters of court ladies, he probably knew Peterborough's, and there is an interesting similarity between the situation of Peterborough and Pope sketching the characters of the same nymphs and Goldsmith and his circle writing epitaphs for one another.

A song written about the same time as Peterborough's "Chloe" but for a very different audience is Isaac Watts's "The Sluggard," included among the "Moral Songs" appended to his Divine Songs for Children (1720). Watts has a considerable reputation as a metrical innovator. Probably his best-known metrical experiment is that with English sapphics in "The Day of Judgement," but Saintsbury remarks wittily that "The voice of the sluggard would have been a most early-rising voice if it had complained in fluent anapaests a few years before." As an overt attempt to further the moral education of children, "The Sluggard" necessarily differs from any of the anapaestic poems I have discussed thus far. Nevertheless there are also similarities. The poem is basically a character-sketch, and characterization is achieved at least to a small degree through dialogue:

'Tis the Voice of the Sluggard; I hear him complain,
You have waked me too soon, I must slumber again.
As the Door on its Hinges, so he on his Bed,
Turns his Sides, and his Shoulders, and his Heavy Head.

A little more Sleep, and a little more Slumber,
Thus he wastes half his Days, and his Hours without Number:
And when he gets up, he sits folding his Hands,
Or walks about sauntering, or trifling he stands.

(pp. 332-33) The poem ends with an explicit and somewhat complacent statement of the moral:
Said I then to my Heart, Here's a Lesson for me,
That Man's but a Picture of what I might be.
But Thanks to my Friends for their Care in my Breeding,
Who taught me betimes to love Working and Reading.

(p. 333)

Although moral judgement is passed on the Sluggard, there is no humour, raillery, or satire in the presentation of his character. While this poem is clearly not in the tradition leading to Goldsmith's Retaliation, "The Sluggard" gives further indication of the range of poems for which the anapaestic tetrameter couplet was used in the early eighteenth century, and it illustrates once again the frequent recourse that the writer of anapaests had to the present participle and gerund. What is interesting and influential about this poem and other of the "Moral Songs" is Watts's success, "mainly through his excellent rhythm and his pleasant images, in expressing something of the innocent delight of childhood." The voice of the innocent speaker in "The Sluggard" is not very different from the voice in a later anapaestic Song of Innocence, Blake's "Chimney Sweeper."

Another kind of eighteenth-century poem in which innocent speakers are to be found is, of course, the pastoral. The only poem in anapaestic tetrameter couplets selected by Goldsmith for inclusion in his anthology The Beauties of English Poesy (1767) is one of John Byrom's better known poems, "Colin and Phebe, a Pastoral," which was first printed as Spectator, No. 603, 6 October 1714. Christopher Anstey was also familiar with this poem, for he parodied Byrom's opening lines:

My time, 0 ye Muses, was happily spent,
When Phebe went with me wherever I went;
Ten thousand sweet pleasures I felt in my breast:
Sure never fond shepherd like Colin was blest!
(I, 1)

Dear mother, my time has been wretchedly spent,
With a gripe or a hickup wherever I went;
My stomach all swell'd, till I thought it would burst,
Sure never poor mortal with wind was so curst!

"Colin and Phebe" has a conventional pastoral subject: a swain's lament for his absent nymph. Byrom evidently conceives of the pastoral as a simple form, akin to the ballad or song—hence the use of anapaests arranged in stanzas. The anapaestic couplets in this poem are arranged in eight-line stanzas, the arrangement preferred by Byrom in the overwhelming majority of his subsequent anapaestic poems. Several other eighteenth-century poets likewise wrote pastoral poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets. John Dyer's "The Inquiry," for example, is a lament for the absent "Clio." Edward Moore's "Song the Second" is an eclogue, in which Collin and Phebe are the speakers. When quoting John Cunningham's "Damon and Phillis: A Pastoral Dialogue," Edith J. Morley remarks on the "unconventional note" struck by the anapaestic tetrameter measure in this kind of poem. Cunningham was less unconventional than Professor Morley apparently realized.

John Byrom wrote over two dozen poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets, and in terms of total numbers of lines he would appear to have written more anapaestic couplets than any other poet between Prior and Goldsmith. Compared to Prior and Swift, Byrom had little influence on the subsequent development of this metrical form. Many of his poems in anapaests are entertaining, some are tedious, but few were published prior to the posthumous edition of his poems in 1773. Many of Byrom's poems were written for his own diversion and for the entertainment and information of his friends: "His hours of leisure were often employed in rhyming on any subject which suited his fancy. The facility with which he communicated his ideas in verse, prompted him to choose topics for his Muse which have been seldom attempted by other poets." Byrom wrote a number of anapaestic verse epistles which have very unusual subjects, in-
deed. In "On the Patron of England, in a Letter to Lord Willoughby, President of the Antiquarian Society," Byrom asks in "plain simple rhymes" (I, 68) whether "hasty transcribers" (I, 66) may not have mistaken Georgius for Gregorius, that is whether England's patron saint should not be St. Gregory instead of St. George. Four anapaestic epistles are devoted to esoteric theological argument on the nature of the Miracle on the Feast of Pentecost, and the subtitle of another states that it was "Occasioned by a Dispute Concerning the Food of St. John the Baptist" (I, 191), whether the "locusts" he ate were insects or herbs. Four other epistles—three on a textual crux in the Iliad and one arguing that Horace advised writers to keep their pieces one year rather than nine—show the impressive classical knowledge, combined perhaps with too great a propensity to emend texts, that Byrom attained at Trinity College, Cambridge, where the master was Dr. Richard Bentley. Leslie Stephen comments on Byrom's attitude toward such pieces:

They were an amusement—a quaint whim characteristic of an oddly constituted brain; and one fancies that when he forces even Hebrew and Greek into the fetters of his 'cantering rhymes,' and twists dry grammatical discussion into comic metres, he feels that the process takes the bitterness out of controversy and enables him to treat thorny subjects in a vein of pleasantry.42

Classical learning would also seem to be responsible for the strict form of most of Byrom's poems in anapaests. In the final stanza of an epistle to Ralph Leycester, thanking him for the present of a hare, Byrom writes: "How age would run on, if the Muse did not fix/The Rhythmus of dactyls to ninety and six" (I, 140). (It seems to have been quite common among eighteenth-century writers to call anapaests "dactyls."43) Most of Byrom's poems in anapaestic couplets consist of twelve eight-line stanzas, or exactly ninety-six lines. None of the poems in anapaestic couplets in Byrom's Miscellaneous Poems exceeds this length. This rule which Byrom
seems to have followed is an intriguing fact about his use of anapaests, but it is not a rule that other poets in the tradition felt obliged to obey.

The poems in which Byrom displays his wit rather than his learning might be expected to find a more ready audience. "A Description of Tunbridge, in a Letter to P. M., Esq." contains many clever things as well as being an interesting anticipation of the more famous epistolary descriptions of a more famous eighteenth-century resort town in the New Bath Guide. The only poem of Byrom's to find a place in Dodsley's Collection of Poems by Several Hands is the "Extempore Verses on a Trial of Skill Between Messrs. Figg and Sutton," which appeared in the definitive six-volume edition of 1758. The poem is a mock-heroic description of prize-fighting, a practice which was beginning to flourish at the time and one which Anstey likewise satirized in The Patriot: A Pindaric Epistle, Addressed to Lord Buckhorse (1767), though only the Appendix to Anstey's poem is in anapaests. In his mock-heroic Byrom skilfully mingles various registers of diction and reference to obtain humour:

Such a force in their blows, you'd have thought it a wonder
Ev'ry stroke they receiv'd did not cleave them asunder;
Yet so great was their courage, so equal their skill,
That they both seem'd as safe as a thief in a mill:
While in doubtful attention dame Victory stood,
And which side to take could not tell for her blood,
But remain'd without moving an inch either way,
Like the ass in the tale 'twixt two bottles of hay:

Till Jove to the Gods signified his intention,
In a speech that he made them, too tedious to mention;
The upshot of it was, that, at that very bout,
From a wound in Figg's side the hot blood spouted out.
(I, 29)

Especially amusing in these lines are the similes, while the classical gods are treated with pleasant disrespect. Byrom's epistle "To Henry Wright, of Mobberly, Esq: On Buying the Picture of F. Malebranche, at
a Sale" deserves mention for its clever rhymes and dialogue. Byrom also composed a number of religious poems in anapaestic couplets, of which perhaps the best is "A Hymn on the Divine Omnipresence; Being a Paraphrase on Psalm CXXXIX. Verse 1-12." While he used the anapaestic tetrameter couplet for a great amount and range of verse, Byrom's strengths in this metrical form remain those of its greater practitioners: the idiomatic phrases and low diction, the use of dialogue, and the presentation of naive, or innocent speakers.

A poet whose output is much smaller but who is much better represented in Dodsley's Collection is Matthew Green. His poem "The Seeker," in anapaestic tetrameter couplets, appeared in the first edition of Dodsley's Collection in 1748, eleven years after the poet's death. "The Seeker," like so many poems in this metrical form, consists of character-sketches, and once again depiction of character is accomplished partly through dialogue:

Said a lecherous old fry'r skulking near Lincoln's-Inn,
(Whose trade's to absolve, but whose pastime's to sin;
Who, spider-like, seizes weak protestant flies,
Which hung in his sophistry cobweb he spies;)
Ah pity your soul, for without our church pale,
If you happen to die, to be damn'd you can't fail;
The bible, you boast, is a wild revelation;
Hear a church that can't err if you hope for salvation.

(A Collection of Poems by Several Hands, I, 152)

Three parallel character-sketches follow, of a nonconformist, an established church parson, and a Quaker (Green, himself, was raised a Quaker, but he seem to have become disgusted with the sect and skeptical in religious matters45). The structure of this poem is somewhat similar to that of Retaliation. The first verse paragraph offers a brief self-portrait and some justification, or at least a pretext, for the character-sketches which follow. Green's satire, however, does not appear to be directed
against individuals, and he attacks vices, at least with the friar, whereas Goldsmith depicts follies and peculiarities.

Twenty-two years before David Garrick's follies were made the subject of Goldsmith's anapaests, Garrick and his wife were praised in the anapaestic couplets of Edward Moore. A poet, dramatist, and periodical essayist, Moore died in 1757, about the time Goldsmith was beginning his writing career. Goldsmith regarded Moore as a writer of ability who had suffered society's neglect (I, 315, 504). In the headnote to the fable of Moore's that he selected for inclusion in The Beauties of English Poesy, Goldsmith writes:

Mr. More was a poet that never had justice done him while living; there are few of the moderns have a more correct taste, or a more pleasing manner of expressing their thoughts. It was upon these fables that he chiefly founded his reputation; yet they are, by no means, his best production.

(V, 326)

"Envy and Fortune, A Tale: To Mrs. Garrick" has a number of similarities to other poems in the anapaestic tradition. Fully one-third of the poem is in dialogue, and Moore's praise of Garrick is indirect in much the same ways as Swift's praise of his friends is. As the title indicates, the poem is a tale, but it does not have the form of a ballad, as do most earlier narratives in this metrical form. Nor has it much similarity to the mock-heroic of John Byrom. The poem was written three years after Garrick's marriage to Eva-Maria Veigel (Miss Violetta), in order to counter critical hostility to Garrick and remarks upon his marriage. The poem opens with a dialogue in which Envy induces Fortune to find Garrick a wife. Knowing the nature of most women, Envy assumes that marriage will destroy Garrick's career. Much of the poem is a conventional attack on women:
Away hurry'd FORTUNE, perplex'd and half mad,
But her promise was pass'd, and a wife must be had:
She travers'd the town from one corner to t'other,
Now knocking at one door, and then at another.
The girls curtsy'd low as she look'd in their faces,
And bridled and primm'd with abundance of graces;
But this was coquettish, and that was a prude,
One stupid and dull, t'other noisy and rude;
A third was affected, quite careless a fourth,
With prate without meaning, and pride without worth;
A fifth, and a sixth, and a seventh were such
As either knew nothing, or something too much—
In short as they pass'd, she to all had objections,
The gay wanted thought, the good-humour'd affections,
The prudent were ugly, the sensible dirty,
And all of them flirts, from fifteen up to thirty.

(pp. 32-33)

But Fortune at last finds Violetta, and Envy is thwarted, recognizing that Garrick "must rise on the stage, from contentment at home" (p. 35).
Moore's occasional poetry shows considerable talent in using the various techniques of indirect praise. In "Envy and Fortune," the tale form provides the distancing effect. To the Right Honourable Henry Pelham: The Humble Petition of the Worshipful Company of Poets and News-Writers is an exercise in praise through ironic blame. The poem, printed on three separate occasions in 1751 and later included in Dodsley's Collection (1755), is an anapaestic tetrameter complaint that Pelham's personal integrity and faultless management of public business have resulted in a dearth of material for those who live either by satire or by flattering the great in their vices.

Moore's other pieces in anapaestic tetrameter couplets are all songs. In fact, John Homer Caskey is of the opinion that, of all his song-measures, Moore uses the swinging anapaests best. I have already mentioned Moore's "Song the Second" in connection with Byrom and anapaesthetic pastoral poems. Moore's "Song the First" appears to use certain of the same conventions as Peterborough's "Chloe." Peterborough's poem begins "I said to my Heart, between sleeping and waking" (Crane, p. 647), and Moore's opens similarly:
"THUS I said to my heart, in a pet t'other day" (p. 177). One of the more attractive of the songs is "Song the Eighth," which Caskey believes was written with Moore's wife in mind. As is typical of anapaestic songs, it is written in four-line stanzas of which the final line is a refrain—in this case, a simple, but memorable one:

I.
THAT Jenny's my friend, my delight, and my pride,
I always have boasted, and seek not to hide;
I dwell on her praises wherever I go,
They say I'm in love, but I answer no, no.

II.
At ev'ning oft-times with what pleasure I see
A note from her hand, "I'll be with you at tea!"
My heart how it bounds, when I hear her below!
But say not 'tis love, for I answer no, no.

III.
She sings me a song, and I echo each strain,
Again I cry, Jenny! sweet Jenny, again!
I kiss her soft lips, as if there I could grow,
And fear I'm in love, though I answer no, no.

Perhaps it is more than coincidence that Goldsmith's Retaliation, though the subject is very different, should have a verbal resemblance to the refrain of a popular song: "Perhaps you may ask if that man was a miser?/ I answer, no, no, for he always was wiser" (ll. 129-30). A I have indicated, it is in popular songs such as Moore's that there is the most persistent tradition of anapaestic tetrameter poems in the eighteenth century.

In most accounts William Shenstone is one of the few poets credited with having composed poems in anapaest, other than songs and ballads, in the period between Swift and Anstey:

When Christopher Anstey published his New Bath Guide in 1766,
anapests had been generally neglected by cultivated poets. Prior's graceful octosyllabics were universally praised and widely imitated; however, in the middle of the eighteenth century, his equally competent anapests knew but desultory and meager followers in Byrom and Shenstone.

I believe that I have already cited sufficient evidence to suggest that this view needs qualification. Further evidence might be supplied by a list of some of the very cultivated men and women, if not cultivated poets, who wrote anapaestic poems included in Dodsley's Collection: the Earl of Chesterfield, Lord Lyttleton, Lord Hervey, Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, Goldsmith's friend Robert Nugent (later Lord Clare), Richard Owen Cambridge, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. For my purposes, Shenstone's conventional love songs hold little interest. His ballad which begins "From Lincoln to London rode forth our young squire" (p. 167) is more interesting, for it contains some satire on women and the pleasures of the town. "The Progress of Advice: A Common Case," one of Shenstone's "Levities," though its stanzaic form suggests the ballad, has a great deal in common with the epigram: the subject is low and the concluding couplet provides a turn in thought. Richard has asked Thomas for advice on his proposed marriage to the servant Mrs. Lucy, and Thomas replies:

"To speak my opinion,
There is not such a bitch in King George's dominion;
And I firmly believe, if thou knew'st her as I do,
Thou wouldst choose out a whipping-post first to be tied to.

"She's peevish, she's thievish, she's ugly, she's old,
And a liar, and a fool, and a slut, and a scold."
Next day Richard hasten'd to church and was wed,
And ere night had inform'd her what Thomas had said.
(pp. 78-79)

The character of Mrs. Lucy is established simply, through Thomas's catalogue of her faults, a technique that tends to break up the anapaestic line. Again, dialogue is one of the most important facets of the poem.
Another of Shenstone's "Levities" in anapaests has a subject that was congenial to Goldsmith also: the portrayal of an indigent poet. Shenstone's "The Poet and the Dun" (1741) is the description of twenty-four hours in a poet's life. In the morning a mercer calls, who has been as patient as Job for over a year. The poet, unable to pay, gives his last shilling and reflects:

Well, now thou art gone, let me govern my passion,
And calmly consider—consider? vexation!
What whore that must paint, and must put on false locks,
And counterfeit joy in the pangs of the pox?
What beggar's wife's nephew, now starved, and now beaten,
Who, wanting to eat, fears himself shall be eaten?
What porter, what turnspit, can deem his case hard?
Or what Dun boast of patience that thinks of a Bard?
Well, I'll leave this poor trade, for no trade can be poorer,
Turn shoe-boy, or courtier, or pimp, or procurer;
Get love, and respect, and good living, and pelf,
And dun some poor dog of a poet myself.
(p. 86)

But another messenger arrives at the poet's door, the footman of a great man, bearing a letter in praise of the poet's last verse epistle. The poet is inspired to scribble until morning, when, to complete the frame, the mercer returns and offers his sentiments about life: "'Ah, Friend! 'tis but idle to make such a pother;/Fate, Fate has ordain'd us to plague one another!" (p. 86). Shenstone appears to engage in an amused presentation of himself as a poet, though there may be little foundation for Johnson's remark that Shenstone's imprudent expenditures resulted in his groves being "haunted by beings very different from fauns and fairies." 52 Shenstone nicely places the occupation of poet into perspective, by means of an incongruous catalogue of trades that are more highly rewarded by society. Shenstone's poems in anapaestic tetrameter couplets consist of love songs and "levities." Significant use is made of dialogue, and some satire can be found. His poems in this metrical form seem quite typical of
those composed in the years between Prior and Goldsmith.

Many poets from Prior to Goldsmith appear to have found the anapaestic tetrameter couplet a very easy metrical form in which to work—hence the profusion of epigrams, familiar verse epistles, and occasional or impromptu poems of various kinds. Hence, too, the abundance of anapaestic poems by noble authors or gentleman of independent means, who wrote for their own diversion instead of for their daily bread, as did an Edward Moore or Oliver Goldsmith. (And even Goldsmith's anapaests were written for pleasure rather than profit.) One gentleman who produced a large number of anapaestic poems in his leisure is Richard Owen Cambridge, the author of *The Scribleriad* and a frequent contributor to the *World*, a periodical edited by Moore for Robert Dodsley. One of Cambridge's earliest poems in anapaests is a poem addressed "To William Whitehead, Esq.," which is a humorous review of all the unpleasantness associated with a life of following the Muses. Better than this self-portrait and mock farewell to poetry are two poems first published in 1754 and 1756 respectively and reprinted in Dodsley's *Collection* (1758): *The Fable of Jotham: To the Borough-Hunters* and *The Fakeer: A Tale*. Characterizing these two poems, as so many anapaestic poems of the eighteenth century, is dialogue. In *The Fable of Jotham* two prospective candidates for a borough in Cornwall ride together from London to Exeter, by which time they have exhausted all current topics of conversation and are thrown upon other sources of amusement:

"Some books, prithee landlord, to pass a dull hour;
No nonsense of parsons, or methodists sour,
No poetical stuff—a dam'n'd jingle of rhymes,
But some pamphlet that's new and a touch on the times."
"Oh Lord!" says mine host, "you may hunt the town round,
I question if any such thing can be found:
I never was ask'd for a book by a guest;
And I'm sure I have all the great folk in the West."
None of these to my knowledge e'er call'd for a book;
But see, sir, the woman with fish, and the cook;
Here's the fattest of carp, shall we dress you a brace?
Would you chuse any soals, or a mullet, or plaice?
"A place," quoth the knight, "we must have to be sure,
But first let us see that our borough' secure.

(XVIII, 288)

This is not very different from Anstey's light anapaestic satire and,
once allowance has been made for its briefer compass, not much inferior
to the New Bath Guide. Although the satire lacks the indignation of a
Swift, it has the same multi-directional nature. In this passage, Cambridge's
satire touches upon the ephemeral literary productions of the day, the cor-
rupt literary taste of the borough-hunters, the absence of culture in the
provinces and of literacy in "the great folk in the West," and the single-
minded place-seeking attitude of the knight that is revealed through Cam-
bridge's pun. Austin Dobson finds the host's speech in The Fable of Jotham
reminiscent of Prior's Down-Hall. The resemblance is there, but so also
are the differences. The stanzaic form has been abandoned by Cambridge,
and the breadth of understanding—expressed through the mingled laughter
and regrets of Down-Hall—has not been attained. Cambridge's Fakeer con-
sists mainly of an amusing dialogue between a famous Fakeer and a wealthy
Indian. The Fakeer has gained his fame "By the merit of running long
nails in his breech" (XVIII, 289). The greater part of the satire is left
until the application of the tale:

Our Fakeer represents all the vot'ries of fame:
Their ideas, their means, and their end is the same;
The sportsman, the buck; all the heroes of vice,
With their gallantry, lewdness, the bottle and dice;
The poets, the critics, the metaphysicians,
The courtier, the patriot, all politicians;
The statesman begirt with th' importunate ring,
(I had almost completed my list with the king)
All labour alike to illustrate my tale;
All tortured by choice with th' invisible nail.

(XVIII, 289)
There are not, I think, many better lines in anapaestic satires of the eighteenth century than the final line of Cambridge's poem: "All tortured by choice with th' invisible nail." The satire in this poem is harsher and more indiscriminate than in either the New Bath Guide or Retaliation.

Cambridge wrote many other anapaestic tetrameter poems both before and after Goldsmith's death. These include imitations of an ode by Horace and an epistle by Boileau, dialogues of various kinds, comments on the French Revolution, and several epigrams. Several verse epistles written to Mary and Agnes Berry in 1789-1790 deserve brief mention even though they fall outside the limits of the period I have prescribed. The poems offer a curious resemblance to the rhyming games that Swift played with Sheridan and other friends. One poem, not printed until 1942, consists of nine lines rhyming with "Swift" (the poet); another, of fourteen lines, all rhyming with "dirt." Interestingly, the Berry sisters had also thought to compare Cambridge to Swift, as it appears from the following lines by Cambridge:

To my Vanity why would you give such a lift
As to liken my nonsense to humour of Swift?
But when humour & nonsense can scarce be distinguisht,
'Twere time that such ideots were fairly extinguisht.
For if thus, like poor Swift, I continue to write,
Like him I shall live to be shewn for a sight.

The presence of Prior and Swift can be sensed behind many of the anapaests of Richard Owen Cambridge. He is a significant figure in the unbroken tradition of anapaesthetic satire from Prior to Goldsmith.

The poet represented by the greatest number of anapaestic tetrameter poems in Dodsley's Collection is William Taylor (1673-1750) of South Weald. Of the ten poems of his included, seven are in anapaesthetic tetrameter couplets. Taylor's anapaestic poems, all epigrammatic, have two predominant subjects—drink and women. All are imitations of "low" characters, and
most contain dialogue. "The Brewer's Coachman" is typical:

Honest William, an easy and good-natured fellow,
Would a little too oft get a little too mellow.
Body coachman was he to an eminent brewer—
No better e'er sate in a box, to be sure.
His coach was kept clean, and no mothers or nurses
Took that care of their babes that he took of his horses.
He had these—ay and fifty good qualities more,
But the business of tipling could ne'er be got o'er:
So his master effectually mended the matter,
By hiring a man, who drank nothing but water.
Now, William, says he, you see the plain case;
Had you drunk as he does, you'd kept a good place.
Drink water! quoth William—had all men done so,
You'd never have wanted a coachman, I trow.
They're soakers, like me, whom you load with reproaches,
That enable you brewers to ride in your coaches.

(V, 290-91)

Although the entire first half of the poem is devoted to the character of William, Taylor's focus is not so much on character as on the humorous ending to the incident provided by William's clever reply to the brewer. Such a focus is not unusual in humorous epigrams that deal with character types instead of portraits of living originals.

I have already mentioned two poems by John Cunningham: his acrostic on Miss Sutton and his "Damon and Phillis: A Pastoral Dialogue." Cunningham, a pastoral poet and actor, is almost an exact contemporary of Goldsmith, having been born in 1729, and like Goldsmith, in Ireland, and pre-deceasing Goldsmith by one year in 1773. Like most of the other poets who have been discussed thus far, Cunningham wrote a number of ballads, songs, and catches in anapaestic tetrameter couplets. The most frequently anthologized of these is "The Miller: A Ballad." The poem is a character-sketch, developed through contrasts between the simple life of an honest miller and the lives of the great, encumbered by cares:

Ere the larks early carrols salute the new day
He springs from his cottage as jocund as May;
He cheerfully whistles, regardless of care,
Or sings the last ballad he bought at the fair:
While courtiers are toil'd in the cobwebs of state,
Or bribing elections in hopes to be great,
No fraud, or ambition his bosom does fill,
Contented he works, if there's grist for his mill.

(pp. 48-49)

Quite apart from its illustrative value as an anapaestic character-sketch, "The Miller" is a skilful composition in its own right. In addition to the contrastive structure of the poem is a chronological pattern, a progress from "the larks early carols" to the Miller's return from the ale-house when he "reels to his pillow, and dreams of no ill" (p. 49). The lines which I have quoted progress from "the larks early carols" to the Miller's equally untroubled whistling or singing of ballads, the reference to ballads supplying an interesting self-reflexive use of the genre. Cunningham shows himself to be a poet very much of his time in his depiction of courtiers as flies "toil'd in the cobwebs of state." Paul Fussell observes that "in general . . . the writers of the eighteenth century will appear to exhibit humanistic habits of response to the degree that they explore the possibilities of moral contempt which reside in the images of insects." The "Miller" is not a satiric portrait, but a realistic and balanced sketch of a common man, one who may be suitably portrayed in an anapaestic tetrameter ballad. A much less significant piece, but nevertheless an interesting one for its place in the tradition of anapaestic tetrameter poems from Prior to Retaliation, is Cunningham's satiric sketch of a card-playing soldier, simply entitled "A Character."

If Cunningham is worthy of mention for his work in genres such as the pastoral, the ballad, and the brief character-sketch, in which the anapaestic tetrameter couplet was used by a large number of poets, he is also interesting for the purpose of illustrating the extension of this metrical form into other genres. The verse fable in the eighteenth century is composed predominantly in octosyllabics. The best-known English fabu-
lists of the eighteenth century—Bernard Mandeville, John Gay, and Edward Moore—all composed their fables in octosyllabics. John Byrom, however, wrote a single fable—"The Ape and the Fox, On the Fruits of Greediness and Credulity"—in anapaestic tetrameter couplets. With John Cunningham three of his four fables are in anapaestic tetrameter, and the fourth is written in alternating anapaestic tetrameter and trimeter lines. Cunningham's achievement as a fabulist is not commensurate with Gay's or Moore's, if for no other reason than lack of quantity. The moral to Cunningham's "The Ant and Caterpillar" recalls Gay—not Gay's Fables, but the final anapaestic song in The Beggar's Opera:

A wretch tho' to-day he's o'erloaded with sorrow,
May soar above those that oppress'd him—tomorrow.
("The Ant and Caterpillar," p. 28)59

But think of this Maxim, and put off your Sorrow.
The Wretch of To-day, may be happy To-morrow.
(The Beggar's Opera, Air LXIX)60

Although both poets use the same maxim, Gay's song is touched by irony while Cunningham's moral is not. The influence of the anapaestic songs in so popular a work as The Beggar's Opera should not be ignored. The other kinds of poems which Cunningham appears to have been one of the few to have attempted in anapaests are prologues and epilogues. The metrical form used for the majority of prologues and epilogues in the eighteenth century is the heroic couplet, albeit a form of the heroic couplet in which the lowering of tone achieved through such devices as feminine rhyme and colloquial diction is permitted. Most of Cunningham's prologues and epilogues, and he attracted some notice for his compositions in these genres, are likewise in heroic couplets, but he wrote one of each in anapaests. The more interesting of the two is "An Epilogue, Spoke by a Child of Nine Year Old".
As the wise ones, within, have assur'd me it's common,
For chits of my age to be aping the woman,
To prove that I've talents as well as another,
Good folks— I ran forward—in spight of my mother;
Don't tell me, says I—they shall know how the case is,
I'm not to be check'd in my airs and my graces;
I was born a coquet—and by goles I'm not idle,
I can ogle already—look peevish and bridle,
And I'll practise new gestures each night and each morning,
'Gainst I reach to my teens,—so I give ye fair warning.

Tho' I move ye, at present, with nothing but laughter,
Look well to your hearts, beaux!—I'll swinge ye hereafter;
Have patience, then, pray, and by practice grown bolder,
I'll promise to please, if I live to grow older.

(pp. 175-76)

Perhaps Cunningham thought the anapaestic couplet well suited to the young, though far from innocent, speaker. Or perhaps he wished to use the metre of love songs to emphasize the discrepancy between the ideal and the hor­rifying, if somewhat funny, reality on the stage. Cunningham's achieve­ment in anapaests is significant primarily for its range and variety, but occasionally also for its depth.

Most of the poets whom I have considered in tracing this tradition wrote a considerable number of poems in anapaests. For Charles Churchill, however, only four anapaestic couplets have been preserved. These lines, in a poem called "The Conclave," appear to have been written before Church­ill's major satires, and they were not printed until 1844. Raymond J. Smith comments as follows:

The English verse satirist of Churchill's day had two major distinct and fairly well-established mediums in which to work: the octosyllabic (iambic tetrameter) couplet and the heroic (iambic pentameter) couplet. Preferring the heroic couplet, which he molded into something distinctly his own, Churchill was proficient in both forms. Early in his career he had tried and then immediately discarded a third type of couplet—one composed of an anapestic rather than an iambic meter. He used this rather unusual meter in an unpublished satire against the dean, Zachary Pearce, and chapter of Westminster, "The Conclave."

... An effect of the anapest is a metrical lightness, one more suitable to burlesque than to the Juvenalian tone that was to become associated with Churchill.
Smith is quite right to contrast the light tone of the anapaestic line with the tone of Juvenalian satire. However, as I have tried to show, the anapaestic metre was not exactly "unusual," as Smith claims. The metrical form is a common one for ballads and songs, both romantic and satiric. There are likewise a significant number of epigrams, epitaphs, character-sketches, and verse epistles composed in anapaests, many of which have satiric intent. In mid-eighteenth-century England there were sufficient models of anapaestic verse to which the prospective satirist might turn. Neither Cambridge in his satiric anapaests, nor Gray in The Candidate, nor Churchill in "The Conclave," nor Anstey in the New Bath Guide was a metrical innovator. Rather there appears to be an unbroken tradition of light satire in anapaests from Prior to Goldsmith and beyond.

Whereas many poems in the anapaestic tetrameter traditions examined here, including Goldsmith's, were posthumous publications of authors who have other claims to fame, the New Bath Guide was extremely popular in Anstey's lifetime and represents his only claim to a place in English literature today. Anstey can be credited with having popularized this metrical form to a greater extent than can any other mid-eighteenth-century author. John Anstey gives this account of his father's best poem:

The epistolary form in which the story is conceived, and the very frame of the the metre in which it is written, (although not the invention of the Author,) is new in its application to the subject of a continued poem... The rich vein of genuine humour and pleasantry by which every scene and incident is enlivened, in a connected system of disguised and temperate satire, entitles it to be regarded as one of the most original poems which has appeared in the last century.

There is nothing new in the anapaestic familiar epistle, nor, I think, in Anstey's brand of light satire, with its satiric devices of parody, blame by praise, the naive speaker, the character-sketch, and the targets who are made to satirize themselves through dialogue. Nevertheless, An-
stey did create something original by combining the tradition of anapaestic light satire with that of epistolary fictional narratives. John Anstey's assessment of what is new in his father's poem seems just, though few modern critics would honour the *New Bath Guide* with such superlatives as "one of the most original poems" of the eighteenth century. Perhaps, however, some of these same critics are unnecessarily harsh: "The pseudo-Juvenalian style of Gifford and Churchill and the more hypothetical satire-as-melodrama of [William] Combe comprise only one end of a spectrum. At the opposite end, amiable and pseudo-Horatian, is Anstey's *New Bath Guide* (1766) with its innocuous tittle-tattle. . . ." Words like "innocuous tittle-tattle" deny Anstey's entertaining poem any value whatsoever. And granted that late eighteenth-century satirists may not have captured the true spirit of Horace and Juvenal, the prefix "pseudo" is too derogatory. Still, it is useful, I think, to consider most anapaestic satire—including two very different poems, the *New Bath Guide* and *Retaliation*—as Horatian.

While there is a great deal in Anstey's poem of interest to students of eighteenth-century satire, I shall confine myself to a brief discussion of Anstey's use of the character-sketch. The poem's first epistle introduces the members of the Blunderhead party. The letter, by Simkin's cousin Jenny, sketches Simkin's character at some length. The letter is written mainly in octosyllabics; the genteel Jenny never adopts the anapaestic couplets of Simkin. In "Letter II" the men who provide the romantic interest for Jenny and for Simkin's sister, Prudence, are introduced:

Now it happens in this very house is a lodger,  
Whose name's NICODEMUS, but some call him ROGER,  
And ROGER'S so kind as my sister to bump  
On a pillion, as soon as she comes from the pump;  
He's a pious good man, and an excellent scholar,  
And I think it is certain no harm can befall her;  
For ROGER is constantly saying his prayers,  
Or singing some spiritual hymn on the stairs.
But my cousin MISS JENNY'S as fresh as a rose,
And the Captain attends her wherever she goes:
The Captain's a worthy good sort of a man.
For he calls in upon us whenever he can,
And often a dinner or supper he takes here,
And JENNY and he talk of MILTON and SHAKESPEARE:
For the life of me now I can't think of his name,
But we all got acquainted as soon as we came.

(pp. 11-12)

These two character-sketches illustrate the blame-through-ironic-praise technique of much of the poem. Given the real name of the Methodist preacher, the reader construes the details of Roger's behaviour quite differently from the way Simkin has. Roger's constant praying and singing in public places are for the reader clear indications of hypocrisy. What Simkin regards as Roger's gallantry toward Prudence is shown to be quite another thing when in "Letter XIV" Prudence describes her election to Methodism by a "vision" of Roger in her sleep. The character-sketch of Captain Cormorant operates similarly. While Simkin praises the Captain for eating with them frequently, the reader recognizes other motives than disinterested friendship. These character-sketches differ in important ways from the portraits in such a poem as Retaliation. First, they are apparently not sketches of actual persons, as is a true literary portrait. Secondly, they share an important characteristic of most set descriptions in fictional narratives. They provide an introduction to characters in such a way that the reader is given an insight into their subsequent actions. Alan S. Fisher distinguishes between the literary portrait and the set description of character: "A portrait is itself an exumplum, an argument in miniature. The author makes his argument neatly within it. Set descriptions in fiction do not properly exemplify the author's argument; they introduce it."65

Some character-sketches in the poem approach much more closely to the literary portrait, as defined by Fisher, and not only because they are sketches of characters who do not reappear later in the poem. What
is different about, for example, the sketches of Peter Tewksbury and Jack Dilettante in "Letter X" is that Anstey supplies a context in which the reader must view the character-sketches. The introductory verse paragraph of the letter supplies the thesis: "persons of taste and true spirit, I find, / Are fond of attracting the eyes of mankind" (p. 62). In fact, this couplet states one of the more important themes of the entire poem. A number of character-sketches follow, which are exempla supporting Anstey's thesis:

What sends PETER TEWKSBURY every night
To the play with such infinite joy and delight?
Why, PETER's a critic, with true Attic salt,
Can damn the performers, can hiss, and find fault,
And tell when we ought to express approbation,
By thumping, and clapping, and vociferation;
So he gains our attention, and all must admire
Young TEWKSBURY's judgment, his spirit and fire,
But JACK DILETTANTE despises the play'rs,
To concerts and musical parties repairs,
With benefit tickets his pockets he fills,
Like a mountebank doctor distributes his bills;
And thus his importance and interest shews,
By conferring his favours wherever he goes;

He has taste, without doubt, and a delicate ear,
No vile oratorios ever could bear;
But talks of the op'ras and his Signiora,
Cries bravo, benissimo, bravo, encorat
And oft is so kind as to thrust in a note
While old Lady Cuckow is straining her throat...

(pp. 63-64)

The argument is made throughout: Peter Tewksbury and Jack Dilettante are the stuff which Bath society is made of. Pretension, attention-seeking, and self-importance masquerade as "spirit" and "taste." The comparison of Jack to a mountebank emphasizes the fact that Jack's "taste" is without a basis in knowledge. "Spirit," likewise debased, is that quality of inner emptiness possessed by a man who defines himself entirely through the estimation of other people. Anstey has frequent recourse to the character-sketch in describing Bath society. His character-sketches are of
several varieties: introductions to the major actors in the narrative; exempla in the poem's argument; and commemorative portraits of real persons, such as Beau Nash ("Letter XI"). In these different types of character-sketches and in the poem's various subjects, the anapaestic tetrameter couplet strikes varied notes, from the vulgar and colloquial to parodies of the sublime.

Given the great popularity of Anstey's poem, there has been some question about whether or not Goldsmith was influenced by the New Bath Guide in his choice of metre for The Haunch of Venison, the "[Letter to Mrs. Bunbury]," and Retaliation. Austin Dobson believes that verbal resemblances between Goldsmith's anapaests and The Grand Question Debated "show plainly that Goldsmith remembered the works of Swift far better than The New Bath Guide, which has sometimes been supposed to have set the tune to the Haunch and Retaliation"; G. S. Fraser states that Goldsmith gets the anapaestic tradition of the eighteenth-century low style from Prior, Swift, and Gay; but Martin S. Day remarks that the Haunch of Venison "almost certainly derived from the Anstey tradition of anaplectic epistles," and though Retaliation "displays no specific Anstey influence, the vogue of the New Bath Guide probably caused Goldsmith to choose satiric anapaests." As I have already indicated, the familiar epistle was composed by a number of writers before Anstey; thus the mere fact that two of Goldsmith's three anapaestic tetrameter poems are epistles does not establish Anstey's influence, as Day implies. In neither subject nor phrasing are there striking similarities between the New Bath Guide and Goldsmith's anapaests, but since no anapaestic couplets by Goldsmith have been preserved that were written prior to 1770, it is reasonable to assume that the popularity of the New Bath Guide was one of the factors that brought Goldsmith's attention to this metrical form. It might also be observed that several
of Swift's anapaestic "Trifles" were first printed at about the same time as the *New Bath Guide*.

The Appendix to Anstey's *Patriot*: A *Pindaric Epistle, Addressed to Lord Buckhorse* (1767), which to my knowledge has not previously been mentioned in connection with Goldsmith's anapaests, bears comparison in a couple of passages to the *Haunch of Venison*, which was composed about three years later. The Appendix to the *Patriot* is a dialogue between the author of the poem, his bookseller, and some wits of the town, in which the reason for the *Patriot's* lack of popularity with the wits is said to be the poem's lack of personal, more specifically political, application. The first resemblance between the two poems is slight and probably coincidental.

Anstey writes, "Come—pray, Mr. TIGHTBOOT, Find out something, do—/And give us your thoughts on a work of virtù" (p. 172); and Goldsmith speaks of the haunch of venison as follows: "I had thoughts, in my Chambers, to place it in view,/To be shewn to my Friends as a piece of Virtu" (ll. 7-8). The second parallel between passages in the two poems is more significant, I believe, because there is a likeness in situation as well as a verbal resemblance. In Anstey's poem the bookseller attempts to purchase the rights to the author's copy, initially making an offer of five pounds:

I'll make it six pieces; and, as I'm a sinner,
Can give nothing more but a family dinner:
If you're quite disengaged, you are welcome to stay,
I've some very good company dine here to day;
There's a pastoral poet from Leadenhall-street,
And a liberty-writer just come from the Fleet;
With a clever young fellow, that's making an index,
Who, perhaps, may assist you to write an APPENDIX;
And a taylor, up three pair of stairs in the Mews,
Who does the political jobs for the news,
And works now and then for the critic reviews.

(pp. 181-82)

The author in Anstey's poem refuses the kind offer of dinner with such "good company." In the *Haunch of Venison* "An Acquaintance, a Friend as
he call'd himself" (l. 36) visits Goldsmith and insists that he have dinner with him, promising such witty companions as Johnson and Burke. The acquaintance continues, "And now that I think on't, as I am a sinner! We wanted this Venison to make out the Dinner" (ll. 51-52). When Goldsmith arrives for dinner the next day, his acquaintance informs him that Johnson and Burke will not be there:

But no matter, I'll warrant we'll make up the party,  
With two full as clever, and ten times as hearty.  
The one is a Scotchman, the other a Jew,  
They both of them merry, and authors like you;  
The one writes the Snarler, the other the Scourge;  
Some think he writes Cinna—he owns to Panurge.  
(ll. 73-78)

The company at the dinner in Goldsmith's poem is of much the same character as in Anstey's—predominantly political hack-writers. The host in each case uses the expression "as I am a sinner." Such parallels as these, of course, merely suggest, rather than firmly establish, Anstey's influence on Goldsmith's anapaests. However, if Anstey did influence Goldsmith's choice of metre in the Haunch of Venison, it is quite possible that the Appendix to the Patriot was better remembered by Goldsmith than was the New Bath Guide.

The strength of Goldsmith's Haunch of Venison is precisely the strength of the whole tradition of anapaestic light verse from the time of Prior: the depiction of character through dialogue. Goldsmith describes his acquaintance as "An under-bred, fine-spoken Fellow," and the manner of the dinner invitation bears this out:

To-morrow you take a poor dinner with me;  
No Words—I insist on't—precisely at three:  
We'll have Johnson, and Burke, all the Wits will be there,  
My acquaintance is slight, or I'd ask my Lord Clare.  
And now that I think on't, as I am a sinner!  
We wanted this Venison to make out the Dinner.  
What say you—a pasty—it shall, and it must,  
And my Wife, little Kitty, is famous for crust.
Here, Porter—this venison with me to Mile-end;  
No stirring—I beg—my dear friend—my dear friend!  
Thus snatching his hat, he brusht off like the wind,  
And the porter and eatables follow'd behind.  

(11. 47-58)

One of the most masterful things about this dramatic narration of the theft of the venison is the wonderfully indirect compliment to Lord Clare that Goldsmith manages to include. Again, such indirect praise is characteristic of the light verse I have been examining, and Goldsmith could have learned the art from Swift or from Moore. Scarcely inferior to the dinner invitation is the conversation around the dinner table, where the vulgar remarks of the Scotchman and Jew provide a poor substitute for the wit of Johnson and Burke. Another quality that Goldsmith shares with the author of *The Grand Question Debated* is the imaginative capacity to create an entire narrative and several characters, even if he borrows a few ideas from Boileau's Third Satire, around a relatively minor incident such as the gift of a haunch of venison.

Another thing that Goldsmith has in common with earlier writers of anapaests, particularly with Prior and Swift, is the presentation of self in verse. In fact, the opportunity he saw for comic self-portrayal may have been one of the factors that drew him to this particular metrical form. The self-portrait which emerges from the *Haunch of Venison* and, to an even greater extent, from the "Letter to Mrs. Bunbury" helps to supply the epitaph on himself that Goldsmith may have intended to write, had his death not prevented the completion of his final poem. The self-portrait that Goldsmith draws for the amusement of Lord Clare is that of a vain and pretentious man. In the very effectiveness of this ironic self-presentation, however, a witty, amusing, and talented man is revealed. Goldsmith characterizes himself partly through dialogue. In response to a question about whether the venison is his own, Goldsmith says preten-
tiously:

Why whose should it be? cried I, with a Flounce,
I get these Things often;--but that was a Bounce:
Some Lords, my acquaintance, that settle the nation,
Are pleas'd to be kind--but I hate ostentation.

(ll. 41-44)

Here is the pretentious man right down to his gesture of disdain. In the
narrative of the poem, it is Goldsmith's vanity and pretension that bring
about as punishment the loss of his venison and an intolerable dinner
among coxcombs and hack-writers. Vanity is also the character-trait that
Goldsmith mocks in the description of his arrival for dinner: "So next
Day in due splendor to make my approach,/I drove to his door in my own
Hackney-coach" (ll. 65-66). The splendour is nicely deflated by the
work "Hackney" at the end of the couplet. Goldsmith presents himself as
a foolishly vain man in his anapaestic poems, in the same way that he
did in conversation, where his irony was frequently misunderstood.

Goldsmith concentrates on somewhat different character-trait in his
depreciatory self-portrait in the "Letter to Mrs. Bunbury," written
approximately three years after the Haunch of Venison, on or about Christ-
mas Day, 1773. To amuse his friends at Barton, the Bunbury residence in
Suffolk, Goldsmith presented himself as a pedantic and avaricious man.
Perhaps, these character-trait are a humorous reflection on his lucra-
tive labours at historical and scientific compilations. He portrays him-
self as a pedant primarily in the prose portion of his letter, in which
he offers tidbits of useless information and captiously critiques the
verse invitation Mrs. Bunbury has sent to him. The verse portion of Gold-
smith's letter is once again an imaginative extension of a simple situa-
tion. The verses begin with a game of Loo at Barton and end in the court-
room before Sir John Fielding, where the Horneck sisters face possible
death as pickpockets. Goldsmith, as he presents himself, is an unlucky
and unskilful card-player. He encourages the other players to take chances,
but "All play in their own way, and think me an ass" (l. 15). Goldsmith's
losses bring out his true character: "I venture at all, while my avarice
regards/The whole pool as my own. Come give me five cards" (11. 23-24).
By a pedantic interpretation of a statute, Goldsmith brings the Horneck
sisters into the Old Bailey, inciting a buzz among the spectators:

Pray what are their crimes? They've been pilfering found.
But pray who have they pilfered? A Doctor I hear.
What yon solemn fac'd odd-looking man that stands near.
The same. What a pity. How does it surprize one
Two handsomer culprits I never set eyes on.
Then their friends all come round me with cringing and leering:
To melt me to pity, and soften my swearing.
First Sir Charles advances, with phrases well strung
Consider Dear Doctor the girls are but young.
The younger the Worse I return him again.
It shews that their habits are all dy'd in grain.
But then they're so handsome, one's bosom it grieves.
What signifies handsome when people are thieves.
But where is your justice; their cases are hard.
What signifies justice; I want the reward.
(11. 48-62)

Although no doubt he was sensitive about his appearance, Goldsmith even
uses a physical description as part of his entertaining self-portrait, and
as a contrast to the handsome young girls. Again the compliments are ob-
lique.

That the "Letter to Mrs. Bunbury" was written in response to a verse
invitation suggests an obvious reason why Goldsmith chose the anapaestic
tetrameter couplet for this poem: Mrs. Bunbury's letter was in the same
metre. One of the anapaestic pieces in Swift's "Trifles" that was first
printed about the time of the New Bath Guide is entitled "An Invitation
to Dinner, from Doctor Sheridan to Doctor Swift." Given the publication
of such a piece in 1765, it is not necessarily Anstey's influence that
induced Mrs. Bunbury to write her epistle to Goldsmith in this metrical
form. With Retaliation, as well, Goldsmith is responding to another person's verse—in this case, Garrick's anapaestic tetrameter epitaph. (The line that Cumberland remembers he wrote on Goldsmith is in iambic pentameter.67) Garrick, himself, used the anapaestic metre frequently, mostly for songs, ballads, and epigrams. However, a few (seven out of one hundred and ten) of Garrick's numerous prologues, epilogues, and interludes are written in anapaestic tetrameter. The epilogue to 'Tis Well It's No Worse (acted November 1770) deserves mention since it consists of twenty-one lines all rhyming with "verse," and since every third line ends, refrain-like, with the title of the play.68 This epilogue—squarely in the tradition of the rhyming games played by Swift and Sheridan, and later in the century by Cambridge—illuminates the continuity of the verse composed in this metrical form during the eighteenth century. Goldsmith's decision to write his Retaliation in anapaests may have been influenced, as well, by his successful use of the form scarcely more than a month before in the "Letter to Mrs. Bunbury," especially when his intended audience was similar.

I have commented little on prosody in my discussion of the poems written in anapaestic tetrameter couplets. A few remarks on versification are in order. The anapaestic tetrameter line, as used by Goldsmith—and he seems typical in this regard—varies from ten to thirteen or fourteen syllables. The most common line is eleven syllables, consisting of an iambic substitution in the initial foot followed by three anapaests. In the anapaestic line, as in the heroic line, the initial foot was the one with which the eighteenth-century poet allowed himself the greatest liberty. The ten-syllable anapaestic tetrameter line has two iambic substitutions; in Goldsmith, these are always in the first and third feet, and there is generally a strong medial pause. Here are examples of ten-syllable lines:
What spirits were his, what wit and what whim. . . .
(Retaliation, l. 53)

Such Dainties to them! their Health it might hurt. . . .
(Haunch of Venison, l. 33)

You honour me much—the Honour is mine. . . .
(Grand Question Debated, l. 73)

The first and third examples illustrate the frequent use of the ten-syllable anapaestic line for purposes of parallelism. Most irregular lines, as the third example might also illustrate, occur when dialogue is reproduced. Two of three anapaestic lines in Goldsmith which have a disyllabic substitution in the third foot without a corresponding substitution in the first, involve dialogue:

He grew lazy at last and drew from himself?
(Retaliation, l. 78)

The whole pool as my own. Come give me five cards.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Ah! The Doctor is lood. Come Doctor, put down.
("Letter to Mrs. Bunbury," 11. 24, 32)

Again these generally exhibit strong medial caesurae. Lines of thirteen or fourteen syllables consist simply of four anapaestic feet with the addition of feminine or triple rhyme. Triple rhyme is rare in Goldsmith's anapaestic poems; in fact, there is only one instance: "For a patriot too cool; for a drudge, disobedient,/And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient" (Retaliation, 11. 39-40). Feminine rhyme, however, is common. Goldsmith avoids triplets in his anapaestic verse, just as he does in his heroic couplet verse. In his avoidance of the triplet, he is unlike most of the other poets in the tradition of light anapaestic verse. Anstey, for example, uses triplets frequently in the New Bath Guide. Goldsmith appears to be a prosodic conservative, even in his anapaests. His achievement in this metrical form is an impressive one. George Saints-
bury calls the anapaests of the _Haunch of Venison_ and _Retaliation_ "pros-
odically consummate" and "the best since Prior." 69

English poetry in anapaests between Prior and Goldsmith appears not to have received the attention it deserves, while the anapaestic satire of the late eighteenth century to some extent has. That anapaestic verse of the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century has not been comprehensively studied has sometimes led critics discussing individual anapaestic poems into inaccuracy or oversimplification in statements concerning the unconventionality of this metrical form. The study of anapaestic verse in the eighteenth century helps to place Prior and Swift in their rightful positions as influential poets. These two poets—as well as Spenser, Milton, and Pope—influenced the course which poetry followed during the eighteenth century. Much of the verse behind which the presence of Prior and Swift can be detected is light verse, which sometimes offers little scope for critical explication since the artifice of such poems may be quite obvious. Playfulness of tone and facility in rhyming are the characteristic qualities of most light anapaestic verse of the period. Some of the best light verse, particularly Prior's, reveals the same delicate balance between compassion and mockery, the same breadth of understanding of man's situation, that is often found in Popean satire. In Prior something of the emotional range of the anapaestic couplet is explored. In a somewhat different way, the same is true for Swift, whose poems in this metrical form have an emotional range from a hatred that can only be expressed in images of degradation and torture to a tenderness for his friends that elicits the imaginative creation of pieces that delight as they gently reprove. The same playful imaginative extension of situation is found in Goldsmith's three anapaestic poems. Lord Clare's gift of a haunch of venison leads to a dinner at "Mile-end" and to Gold-
Smith's amusing reflections on his own vanity. An invitation to play Loo at Barton leads to the Old Bailey and to Goldsmith's presentation of himself as a pedantic and avaricious man. A dinner club calls forth a reverie in which the members are metaphorically conceived as dishes and in which Goldsmith presents himself as a compiler and a "fool." Such ironic self-portrayal is another characteristic of the anapaestic tradition, one which Goldsmith again shares with Swift. Self-portrayal and self-deprecation are sometimes associated with the Horatian voice, with which the anapaestic tradition shares its low, colloquial style. Martin Day's description of anapaestic political satire of the late eighteenth century holds true for most satire in anapaest: "In comparison with heroic couplet satire, this verse was facetious rather than solemn, and more laughing than declaiming. Usually it was also more ingenious and imaginative." The tone is usually familiar and comic, rather than biting. The low, colloquial style has as one of its main features the representation of dialogue, often quite realistically reproduced. Scarcely a poet who wrote in anapaests between Prior and Goldsmith failed to attempt the reproduction of speech and the depiction of character through dialogue. Character-sketches in anapaestic metre are extremely numerous and might even be said to constitute an alternative portrait tradition to the greater satiric tradition of predominantly heroic couplet portraiture. A detailed analysis of several anapaestic portraits, those in Goldsmith's Retaliation, will form the subject of my final chapter.
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Chapter III: The Structure and Portraits of Retaliation

The originality of Goldsmith's Retaliation resides in the combination of the portrait-gallery structure with the tradition of anapaestic mock-epitaphs. The poem consists of a frame followed by nine mock-epitaphs. As I have suggested in connection with Matthew Green's "Seeker," the introductory verse paragraph might be said to provide a pretext, rather than a justification, for the ensuing portraits. The structural principle in Retaliation is to be discovered not in the introduction to the poem but in the numerous contrasts between the portraits. The arrangement is not simply that of contrasting pairs of portraits. Rather, as I have indicated, a web of contrasting faults and virtues joins the several portraits and provides the unifying principle of the poem. In Retaliation, Goldsmith adopts a balanced manner of portraiture; in many lines of the poem, he appears to have desired an effect of equivocation. Tom Davis believes that the balanced portrayal of Goldsmith's friends in Retaliation operates similarly to the balanced Characters of nations in The Traveller: "The technique is essentially the same as that of The Traveller, though it is handled more subtly: the praiseworthy qualities are also the qualities attacked."¹ Davis's suggestion fails to account for the most obvious quality of Retaliation: the great variety of the portraits resulting from an apparent diversity of portraiture technique. While a similar kind of contrastive structure is fundamental to both poems, there is no apparent diversity of portraiture technique in The Traveller. In that poem Goldsmith adopts a version of Pope's theory of the Ruling Pas-
sion and combines it with notions concerning the effects of climate on
national character to arrive at the scheme which all the Characters in the
poem exemplify:

Hence every state, to one lov'd blessing prone,
Conforms and models life to that alone.
Each to the favourite happiness attends,
And spurns the plan that aims at other ends;
'Till, carried to excess in each domain,
This favourite good begets peculiar pain.

(11. 93-98)

Davis's suggestion only holds true in *Retaliation* for Edmund Burke, whose
genius is both praised and blamed, and possibly for Richard Burke, whose
jesting makes his company desirable until, by carrying his frolic to ex-
cess, he becomes an annoyance. It seems obvious that the portraits of
Edmund Burke and David Garrick, on the one hand, are not composed in the
same way as are the portraits of Dean Barnard, Dr. Douglas, and Joseph
Hickey, on the other. The portraits in *Retaliation* range from profound
analyses of character to sketches in which little or nothing is learned
about the individuals depicted. I have, therefore, elected to divide the
portraits in *Retaliation* into major portraits and minor ones. The major
portraits, in my opinion, are four: Edmund Burke, Cumberland, Garrick,
and Reynolds. Although the portrait of Cumberland is as much dramatic
criticism as character analysis, it is much too skilful and too central
to the main contrasts of the poem to be placed among the minor portraits.
Likewise, though the portrait of Reynolds is short and possibly incomplete,
it is important because of the way in which Reynolds approaches an ideal.
These four portraits have a close relationship to the main eighteenth-cen-
tury satiric portrait tradition, in which we find such characters as Wharton,
Mac Flecknoe, Bufo, and Sporus. Such earlier portraits in the tradition
will be mentioned when they seem pertinent to *Retaliation*. The minor
portraits in Retaliation might be called epigrammatic portraits, for they bear a close relationship in length and technique to some of the anapaestic epigrams and epitaphs that were examined in the previous chapter.

The presence of minor and major portraits in the poem is probably not solely, or even primarily, due to aesthetic considerations. The two types of portrait are rather the result of the occasional nature of the poem. Unlike Pope in the Epistles to Several Persons or the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, Goldsmith could not choose the men he wished to portray from throughout society, from among the living and the dead, from heroes and villains, from friends and enemies. His cast of characters was chosen for him. While Dryden was able to overcome a similar limitation in Absalom and Achitophel, Dryden had advantages that Goldsmith did not have. All of the characters that Dryden was required to draw were significant public men, whose characters were widely known. Only a few of Goldsmith's characters answer to that description. Goldsmith could clearly not attempt to analyze the characters of all his subjects in the same depth as he did Garrick's, whom he knew well and about whom he had firm opinions. The particular problems of portraiture and of artistic unity that Goldsmith faced, though solved to a considerable degree, limit the success of Retaliation, at least in its incomplete state.

For one reason or another, Goldsmith appears to have experienced some difficulty in completing his major poems. Four of the last five couplets in The Traveller were written by Samuel Johnson, as were the final four lines of The Deserted Village. Retaliation—composed amidst illness, financial difficulties, and labours for the booksellers—is no exception. Perhaps Goldsmith could not shape his material into the unified work he would have liked, or perhaps he just ran out of time. In any case, as Arthur Friedman indicates, Goldsmith almost completed the plan
In the bill of fare at the beginning of the poem eleven names appear. For the first seven of these there are complete epitaphs in the same order as in their first appearance. For the remaining four—Ridge, Reynolds, Hickey, and Goldsmith, in the order of the initial list—there is no epitaph for Ridge, Reynolds's epitaph appears at the end of the poem and may be incomplete, Hickey's epitaph is complete but appears out of order before that of Reynolds, and Goldsmith's epitaph—if indeed he planned one for himself, since in line 22 he alone is left alive to tell what he thinks of the dead—is absent.

(Friedman, IV, 344)

Clearly another pretext than that supplied in the opening verse paragraph would have been necessary had Goldsmith wished to continue the poem with an epitaph on himself. It is doubtful that the kind of ironic self-portrait which Goldsmith might be expected to produce would provide a more suitable ending to the poem than does the normative portrait of Reynolds. There is a certain appropriateness in concluding a series of literary portraits with a character-sketch of the greatest portraitist of the day. Reynolds is an ideal not only in his personal qualities but in his professional capacity of understanding and depicting men's characters. If Goldsmith intended to end his poem with the epitaph on Reynolds, then he has used a portrait-gallery structure similar to that in Pope's Epistle to a Lady, or to Pope's and Peterborough's anapaestic poems on court ladies.

If Goldsmith intended to end his Retaliation with the epitaph on Reynolds, he has written a comic satire in which only the first half of an outer frame is present. Mary Claire Randolph notes that frequently in formal verse satires "an outer shell-like framework encloses the entire piece," and the setting is one "wherein people pass by and thus provide a steady stream of type-figures on whom the Satirist can comment to the Adversarius." In Retaliation, instead of type-figures passing by, there are individuals stretched out beneath a table, where the poet—
who is, I have suggested, a burlesque of the judicial satirist—can see
them to comment on. The *adversarius* in *Retaliation* is only suggested,
through the device of internal dialogue. Internal dialogue is most evi-
dent in the portrait of Hickey, but also appears incidentally elsewhere
in the poem, as in the portrait of William Burke: "Would you ask for
his merits, alas! he had none" (l. 49). Alexander Pope's frequent use
of internal dialogue in his formal verse satires "gives an interesting
complexity to the satirist's outlook and makes him appear more reasonable
and open-minded to the reader than he would otherwise have seemed."^4

Internal dialogue in *Retaliation* consists almost entirely of questions and
answers designed to create an effect of equivocation, for either the an-
swers are left in doubt or the answers may be such that, while they deny
a fault, they also imply the opposite fault to that which has been denied.
Although more will be said about internal dialogue in the discussion of
the portraits, an example may be necessary here to clarify this point.
In the internal dialogue in which Hickey's single fault is determined,
this question and answer appear: "Too courteous, perhaps, or obligingly
flat;/His very worst foe can't accuse him of that" (ll. 131-32). The an-
swer is so very definite that the implication may be that not only is
Hickey not too courteous, but he lacks common courtesy. Besides the fram-
ing device, the satiric portrait, and the implied *adversarius*, one other
point about the relationship of *Retaliation* to formal verse satire might
be made. It was generally accepted in the eighteenth century that the
English word *satire* was derived from *satura*, the word the Romans used for
the genre of formal verse satire. The literal meaning of *satura* is "a
mixed dish of meats."^5 It is possible that Goldsmith, by characterizing
his friends as various meats, intended an elaborate word-play on the ety-
ology of satire. The introductory section of his poem is literally a
Such a word-play seems consistent with his burlesque of the judicial satirist's function, with what I have earlier called his "playful commentary on the conventional pretense of the satirist that he has portrayed no living characters," and with the use of conventions of formal verse satire.

Likewise consistent with a burlesque of serious satire is the reference in the opening line to the famous burlesque poet Paul Scarron. That Goldsmith should mention Scarron's dinners as a parallel to those at which he himself was one of the distinguished wits present also has some biographical significance—that is, it adds a little to the unwritten portrait of Goldsmith that must be reconstructed. Roger Lonsdale remarks that "Goldsmith was fascinated by distinguished men—Samuel Butler, Berkeley, Boyle, Pope—whose genius was belied by an unattractive appearance or awkward manner." Scarron can be added to Lonsdale's list. When Goldsmith mentions Scarron in one of his letters, he appears to identify with Scarron, as a kind of type-figure of literary merit neglected. Like Goldsmith, Scarron was afflicted at an early age by a disease that rendered him less than handsome. Despite his unattractive appearance, Scarron was a witty conversationalist, he married one of the more beautiful women of his day, and his salon was frequented by distinguished company. Particularly as a conversationalist, Scarron would seem to be the kind of man who might provide both a source of fascination and a model for Goldsmith.

Before proceeding to the portraits of the poem, the details of the frame—in particular, the dishes under which Goldsmith metaphorically characterizes his friends—remain to be briefly considered. The significance of some of these dishes is obvious. For example, that Edmund Burke should "be tongue, with a garnish of brains" (l. 6) requires no explication. The phrase used to describe Thomas Barnard, "venison, just fresh from the plains"
(l. 5), has the positive association of rarity, high value, and delicacy without luxury. "Our Will shall be wild fowl, of excellent flavour" (l. 7) indicates, in the light of Goldsmith's epitaph, that William Burke is the opposite of a tame or domestic man. He is ruled by passion, instead of by reason. He may be flighty, but his heart is basically good—hence, the "excellent flavour." The "pepper" (l. 8) of Richard Burke captures the quality of a lively and biting wit. The delicacy of "sweet-bread" (l. 9) and the lighter fare of "sallad" (l. 11) are contrasted to British "pudding, substantial and plain" (l. 10), a foretaste of the contrasts between the epitaphs themselves. It is, of course, quite appropriate for a clergyman to be "substantial and plain." In any case, for the eighteenth-century poet, pudding seems to have been associated with the typical clergyman's diet. Gay writes, "Pudding our Parson eats, the Squire loves Hare." (The Shepherd's Week, "Monday," l. 91); part of the simple fare provided by Pope's Country Mouse for his Town guest is "Pudding, that might have pleas'd a Dean" (Satire II vi, l. 166); and Savage's Progress of a Divine: A Satire contains the following lines: "'A Curate?—Where? His Name (cries one) recite!/Or tell me this—Is Pudding his Delight?/ 'Why, Our's loves Pudding!'—Does he so?—'tis He!" (ll. 23-25).10 The choice of dish to which to compare Dr. Douglas must have followed quite naturally. In the opening verse paragraph, David Garrick is presented as a baffling man, reconciling in himself several contrary qualities: "Oil, vinegar, sugar, and saltiness agree" (l. 12). Oil and vinegar have traditionally been considered as opposites in their effects on wounds: oil soothes while vinegar causes greater pain. Here the words would seem to apply to Garrick's character and conversation: Garrick can be either smooth or sour; his speech can soothe and flatter, or it can hurt. Likewise the antithesis between sugar and salt represents the sweetness and wittiness
of which Garrick is alternately capable. An entire couplet is devoted
to Garrick in the opening verse paragraph, more than to any other person.
This is reflected in the proportionately longer epitaph on Garrick in the
poem. The longest metaphorical description and the longest epitaph are
given to the man who was the major source of the retaliatory impulse in
Goldsmith. These facts suggest that Goldsmith intended the portrait of
Garrick to be the climax of the poem. It is certainly climactic in terms
of interest and in terms of artistic merit, but whether or not it also
draws together the separate strands of the poem, providing a thematic
centre, is a question that I shall attempt to answer when dealing with
the portrait of Garrick in detail. For Ridge as "anchovy" (l. 14), as
there is no epitaph on him in the poem, nothing can be added beyond what
appeared in the Explanatory Notes to the early editions of Retaliation:
"'Counsellor John Ridge, a gentleman belonging to the Irish bar, the relish
of whose agreeable and pointed conversation is admitted, by all his acquain­tance, to be very properly compared to the above sauce'" (Friedman, IV,
353n). No doubt "Reynolds is lamb" (l. 14) simply in the sense that he is
as gentle, or should I say as bland, as a lamb. A "capon" (l. 15), the
dish thought fitting to describe Hickey, seems as uncomplimentary as any.
Having the basic meaning of "a castrated cock" or, as applied to persons,
"a eunuch," capon is used "as a type of dullness, and a term of reproach"
(OED). The word is used in this last sense in one of Swift's "Trifles,"
in which he addresses Sheridan as "you Capon ye" (III, 1033). The char­acterization of his friends as various dishes has generally been considered
the weakest part of Goldsmith's poem. After having heard the poem read,
Richard Cumberland wrote to Garrick: '"... Dr. Goldsmith's Dinner was
very ingenius, but evidently written with haste and negligence. The Dishes
were nothing to the purpose, but they were followed by Epitaphs that had
humour, some Satire and more panegyric." Goldsmith's primary intention
with his Dishes must have been to amuse his friends, and at least with Cumberland he was unsuccessful. Although I would argue that Goldsmith's Dishes are very much to the purpose in capturing individual or professional characteristics of his friends, I would have to admit that none of these lines is very memorable except that on Burke, a line in which the literal and metaphorical senses of "tongue" and "brains" coincide.

What the opening verse paragraph does illustrate well is the imaginative extension of situation characteristic of many of Swift's and Goldsmith's anapaestic poems. The ingredients with which Goldsmith worked—a dinner club and an epitaph-writing contest—are radically transformed. The delight that Goldsmith finds in absurdity is apparent. He is not particularly concerned about any inconsistency in describing his companions as dishes and then, in the same verse paragraph, having these same companions become quite humanly drunk, nor I think about any inconsistency in praising men who are sunk "under the table." Retaliation is a playful poem, and what Johnson said of Shenstone's "Levities"—that they are "exempted from the severities of criticism"—may have application for Goldsmith's final poem with regard to, at least, a certain kind of criticism. To write epitaphs on the occasion of men being dead drunk instead of dead in actuality is nothing if not playful. Such levity is also, of course, consistent with attitudes that Goldsmith held throughout a career in which he frequently attacked the false flatteries and pathetic fallacies of contemporary elegiac compositions. Here is how Goldsmith treats the pathetic fallacy in one of his mock-elegies, "On the Death of the Right Honourable * * *":

How sad the groves and plains appear,
And sympathetic sheep:
Even pitying hills could drop a tear!
—If hills could learn to weep.

(IV, 377)
Also in Goldsmith's "Chinese Letters," where these verses first appeared, are Lien Chi Altangi's observations on epitaphs:

When we read those monumental histories of the dead, it may be justly said, that all men are equal in the dust; for they all appear equally remarkable for being the most sincere Christians, the most benevolent neighbours, and the honestest men of their time. To go thro' an European cemetery, one would be apt to wonder how mankind could have so basely degenerated from such excellent ancestors; every tomb pretends to claim your reverence and regret; some are praised for piety in those inscriptions who never entered the temple until they were dead; some are praised for being excellent poets, who were never mentioned, except for their dulness, when living; others for sublime orators, who were never noted except for their impudence; and others still for military achievements, who were never in any other skirmishes but with the watch.

(II, 55)

The fine series of mock-epitaphs in Goldsmith's final poem is a fitting culmination to his numerous mockeries of the deviations from truth so common in expressions of the elegiac impulse. Goldsmith's concern for truth no doubt led to the kind of balanced portraiture he undertook when playfully sketching the characters of actual individuals. While the opening verse paragraph succeeds in establishing the playful and colloquial tone, it does not really provide a context in which the portraits can be understood. Goldsmith leaves the controlling context to be inferred from the parallels and contrasts found among the portraits themselves. The introduction to the poem only serves to establish some of the contrasts that are developed more fully; it offers no direct exposition of theme.

The first of the epitaphs, that on Thomas Barnard, is also the shortest. It is a minor portrait, or what I have referred to as an epigrammatic portrait. Goldsmith reveals little about Barnard's character. Instead the sketch is structured around the epigrammatic turn of thought which takes the reader from the implication that Barnard is faultless to the suggestion in the final line that Barnard has some manner of fault
in the very cunning with which he hides his faults. The unusual expression "sly-boots" (l. 28), which serves to establish the low, colloquial tone, is also used by Swift in one of his "Trifles" (III, 1003). Goldsmith's portrait of Doctor Barnard is, on the whole, complimentary, as it appears from the first couplet: "Here lies the good Dean, re-united to earth,/ Who mixt reason with pleasure, and wisdom with mirth" (ll. 23-24). Were it not for the lightness of the metre, this couplet might be found in a serious epitaph. Most of the humour in the couplet arises from the situation, for the Dean lies not beneath the ground but merely beneath the table. Still there is nothing to undermine the praise of Barnard in the second line. He mixes "wisdom with mirth," unlike Richard Burke, who, as Goldsmith depicts him, is all "mirth" (Goldsmith repeats the word in line 59), lacking the wisdom which would place the necessary restraints on his jesting and thus make "Dick" a more pleasant companion. The sincere praise of Thomas Barnard suggests that Goldsmith wanted both the first and last characters in the poem to be, at least in part, normative figures.

Each of the first two portraits in the poem begins in the same way, and the same epithet is applied to both Thomas Barnard and Edmund Burke: "Here lies the good Dean" (l. 23) and "Here lies our good Edmund" (l. 29). The epithet which Goldsmith has chosen is not a very distinctive one, and if Barnard and Burke, as Goldsmith depicts them, are similar in anything, it is rather intellectual capacity than goodness. The next two portraits, those of the minor Burkes, are likewise introduced similarly to one another: "Here lies honest William" (l. 43) and "Here lies honest Richard (l. 51). The second pair of portraits in Retaliation is set in opposition to the first pair. William and Richard Burke, as portrayed by Goldsmith are remarkable for their lack of wisdom. While "honesty" was not perhaps the most striking quality of William and Richard Burke, there is no indica-
tion that Goldsmith's portraits of them were intended ironically. William Burke, though like Edmund a Member of Parliament, is not remembered for his abilities as an orator. What he is known for are his stockjobbing transactions and financial speculations. Dixon Wecter has suggested "that Goldsmith may have had some personal knowledge of the unsavoury reputation which clung to the lesser Burkes who figure in 'Retaliation' ... and whose scramble for money did so much to bring the name of Burke into disrepute." There is a tradition—deriving from Lawrence Dundas Campbell's "Life of Hugh Boyd," in The Miscellaneous Works of Hugh Boyd (1800)—that Goldsmith was convinced by Boyd to alter his original sketches of the Burkes, especially that of William, because they were too severe. Wecter believes that this story possibly originated with private remarks that Goldsmith may have made in disapproval of the Burkes' conduct of financial affairs, because Goldsmith would hardly "have aired such grave charges in a facetious poem intended for circulation." Goldsmith had no intention to dissolve friendships by the writing of Retaliation. It is unlikely that Goldsmith initially wrote characters of the Burkes which lacked entirely the delicacy of the satire in the printed version.

The essence of William Burke's character, for Goldsmith, is that he is ruled by his heart instead of his head. Goldsmith is not morally indignant about William Burke's failure to subdue his passions, but neither does he express approval of such submission to feeling. Although the heart of William Burke "was a mint" (l. 43) and although Garrick also had "an excellent heart" (l. 97), Goldsmith does not imply that the hearts of men are universally and naturally good. In the portrait of William Burke, Goldsmith is neither sentimentalist nor vigorous opponent of sentimentalism. Goldsmith's attitude toward William Burke is one of gentle mockery. Burke apparently does not conform to the proper order of things,
but, in the world of *Retaliation*, his failure to so conform is considered a foible instead of a crime. Every couplet in the portrait contributes to establish the essence of Burke's character: he acts by inner impulse, and cannot properly explain the reasons for his conduct (ll. 45-46). The same opposition between feeling and thinking is found in the most difficult couplet in the epitaph: "Still aiming at honour, yet fearing to roam,/The coachman was tipsy, the chariot drove home" (ll. 47-48). Lucy S. Sutherland suggests that Goldsmith's couplet may possibly refer to an incident that took place at Sir William Young's property, Dellaford, in 1770. Edmund Burke describes the incident in a letter to Sir William:

> Permit me just to hint a complaint of the exuberance of your Hospitality. It is necessary that either the masters or the servants should be temperate; I should not like to be the party under prudential restraints in your house. If Mr W. Burke had not been a good Whip we should have been obliged to walk home from Dellaford. However, no accident has happened nor much inconvenience.

It seems quite unlikely that Goldsmith would refer to such an insignificant incident that had occurred almost four years before he wrote *Retaliation*. Furthermore, the facts of this incident do not correspond very well with the sense of Goldsmith's line. At Dellaford the servants became tipsy, but William Burke was able to drive the horses. In *Retaliation*, both "coachman" and "chariot" metaphorically represent parts of William Burke: his head and his heart, respectively. Goldsmith's couplet might be paraphrased in this way: William Burke always *thinks* that he should perform honourable actions, but his *feeling* of fear prevents the necessary endeavour; his mind is incapacitated, as if by drink, and his feelings carry him away from endeavour to safety. The coachman/chariot metaphor, though unusual, is a good one, since it supplies the standard by which William Burke's conduct is judged improper. The coachman is the proper
driver of a chariot, and the normal order of things is upset when, through
the coachman's drunkenness, the horses are permitted to take control.
Given Goldsmith's training in classical logic, the metaphor must have
appeared an especially apt one; for, as man in the logic texts was defined
as animal rationale, so the horse was the most common example of animal
irrationale. Despite the richness of Goldsmith's metaphor, it is intro­
duced almost as if it were intended as a specific example of Burke's be­
haviour. Miss Sutherland may not be wrong to seek a biographical source
for the line, even though the one she has suggested seems improbable.

The epitaph on William Burke is structured in much the same manner
as the first minor portrait, the epitaph on Thomas Barnard. The emphasis
is once again on an epigrammatic turn of thought involving the activity
of discovering faults or virtues, as much as it is on the faults and vir­
tues themselves. This pattern is repeated in a third minor portrait, that
on Joseph Hickey. Goldsmith reveals more about William Burke than he does
about Thomas Barnard, but the epitaphs on both are weak as portraits be­
cause they lack a sufficient number of representative details of behaviour.
They are less weak when seen in the tradition of anapaestic epigrams and
mock-epitaphs, in which the emphasis is sometimes placed as much on the
witty turn of thought as on the analysis of character. The epitaph on
Richard Burke, though still a minor portrait, offers a short series of
representative actions in parallel phrases:

What spirits were his, what wit and what whim,
Now breaking a jest, and now breaking a limb;
Now rangling and grumbling to keep up the ball,
Now teazing and vexing, yet laughing at all?
(II. 53-56)

The epitaph on Richard Burke is marked by many of the usual characteris­
tics of anapaestic verse, notably the frequent use of present participles
and the colloquial style. Present participles, in this case, very effec-
tively convey the sense of continuous and unrestrained activity which is
central to Richard Burke's character, as Goldsmith sees it. The lowness
of the style is likewise appropriate here, for Goldsmith conceives of
Richard Burke as a low character, as a buffoon almost. The line "Now
breaking a jest, and now breaking a limb" evokes the image of a knock-
about comedian, though this line also has a definite basis in Richard
Burke's life, as it appears from the explanatory notes included in an
early edition of the poem: "This gentleman having slightly fractured
one of his arms and legs, at different times, the Doctor has rallied him
on those accidents, as a kind of retributive justice for breaking his jests
upon other people" (Friedman, IV, 355n). The breaking of jests, a low
expression, seems to be an activity endemic to buffoons and others who
try to appear wittier than they are. Samuel Butler's "Small Poet," for
example, "takes Jests from the Owners and breaks them . . ." (p. 84),18
and his "Buffoon" "breaks jests, as man [sic] do glasses, by mischance. . ."
(p. 254). The guide in the Tower in The London Spy "now and then endeav-
oured to break a jest to divert his customers, but did it so like an Irish-
man that I had much ado to forbear telling the fellow what a fool he was
in endeavouring to be witty."19 Richard Burke has wit, but at the same
time he attempts to be too unrelievedly witty: "In short so provoking
a Devil was Dick, /That we wish'd him full ten times a day at Old Nick. . ."
(ll. 57-58). The references to the Devil in this couplet illustrate well
how distant Retaliation is from the satanic imagery and actual curses of
earlier verse satires. Again, Goldsmith offers what amounts to a playful
commentary on satiric tradition, whether it is intentional or not.

The fourth and the longest of the minor portraits in Retaliation
is a depiction of Dr. John Douglas—scarcely a depiction, actually, for
almost all of what Goldsmith reveals about Douglas's character is contained in the first of the seven couplets in the epitaph: "Here Douglas retires from his toils to relax,/The scourge of impostors, the terror of quacks..." (ll. 79-80). The epitaph opens with a transition from the sketch of Richard Cumberland by way of the contrast between Douglas's "toils" and Cumberland's laziness (l. 78). According to Sir Leslie Stephen, industry was indeed a prominent character-trait of Dr. Douglas: "his family never saw him without a book or pen in his hand when not in company..." 20

What follows after the opening couplet of the epitaph on Douglas are satire on Douglas's targets and description of the society which prompts Douglas's "toils." Thus, the portraiture technique in this epitaph is quite different from the techniques employed by Goldsmith in the other epitaphs I have examined to this point. The style Goldsmith adopts for this epitaph lies in sharp contrast to the low, colloquial style of the epitaph on Richard Burke:

Come all ye quack bards, and ye quacking divines,  
Come and dance on the spot where your tyrant reclines,  
When Satire and Censure encircl'd his throne,  
I fear'd for your safety, I fear'd for my own;  
But now he is gone, and we want a detector,  
Our Dodds shall be pious, our Kenricks shall lecture;  
Macpherson write bombast, and call it a style,  
Our Townshend make speeches, and I shall compile;  
New Lauders and Bowers the Tweed shall cross over,  
No countryman living their tricks to discover;  
Detection her taper shall quench to a spark,  
And Scotchman meet Scotchman and cheat in the dark.  
(ll. 81-92)

Now this is much closer to serious satire. As is also true of so many satires in heroic couplets, the verses are filled with the names of offenders, though the presence of Goldsmith himself among the guilty partly undermines serious satiric intent. The style is likewise raised by the apostrophe to the offenders and by the use of personified abstractions.
The seriousness of the apostrophe, however, is undercut by the low word "quacking." Here is the kind of mingling of different registers of diction, which, as I have noted, characterizes Byrom's mock-heroic anapaests, and which constitutes one of the chief delights of eighteenth-century poetry. Here, the personified abstractions, as is frequently the case in the poetry of this period, produce a pictorial effect. The first picture is that of Douglas seated on a throne, being circled by the figures Satire and Censure. The second picture represents Detection and her taper, the quenching of the taper paralleling the death of Douglas. Satire on Scots is typical of Goldsmith's time, but it is less typically combined with the praise of a Scot such as that which Goldsmith devotes to Douglas. Of course, the lines on Douglas do not form part of Goldsmith's poem solely by contrast to the rest of it. An important theme of Retaliation is expressed in these lines. All of the offenders that Goldsmith singles out from the herd share one thing—the misapplication of their talents.

Dodd was not formed for piety, nor Kenrick for lecturing, Macpherson for epic poetry, Townshend for oratory, Goldsmith for wasting his literary talent on compilations. Where there is satire elsewhere in the poem, the misapplication of talents is frequently its subject. Edmund Burke "cuts blocks with a razor" (1. 42); Cumberland claims to write comedy, but he does not; and Garrick acts when he should be sincere. Reynolds, the norm in this respect, was born to do what he does so well.

Immediately preceding the portrait of the "bland" Reynolds is that of the "blunt" Hickey. Reynolds's manners represent a definite contrast to Hickey's, and Goldsmith states explicitly that Reynolds's manners are the norm by which those of other men should be judged (11. 141-42). That the epitaph of the person who might profit most from the example of Reynolds's good manners immediately precedes the epitaph of Reynolds, himself,
suggests that Goldsmith has carefully planned the ordering of the portraits in *Retaliation*. Most of the epitaphs in the poem have parallels and contrasts with both the preceding epitaph and the succeeding one. The portrait of Hickey is no exception. In his manners, he is opposed to Reynolds; in his treatment of friends, to Garrick. Garrick "cast off his friends, as a huntsman his pack" (1. 107): the simile implies that Garrick treats his friends as if they were inferiors or dependents. Of Hickey, on the other hand, Goldsmith says that "He cherish'd his friend, and he relish'd a bumper" (1. 127). The satiric norms, as I have said, are mainly found in the web of contrasts in the poem. Nearly all of the nine men portrayed (ten if self-portrayal is counted) are praised for virtues, and many of these virtues are notably lacking from the characters of others in the club. Given, however, Goldsmith's equivocations between praise and criticism, many of these contrasts are complex. The opposition between Garrick's and Hickey's attitudes toward friends is one of these. The complexity arises from the second half of the line on Hickey and friendship: "he relish'd a bumper." Since a good companion may, or even ought to, enjoy a social drink, Goldsmith appears to be presenting an admirable quality in Hickey, and this impression is strengthened by the contrast between Hickey's healthy, and Garrick's diseased, "relish" (l. 111). But the second half of the line on Hickey provides further problems. Are friendship and alcoholic beverages things of equal value for Hickey, as may be implied by the coordinate and parallel structure of the line? Is Goldsmith praising Hickey, or is he accusing him of a lack of discrimination, by means of a satiric technique that Pope had perfected in *The Rape of the Lock*—the structural equation of things of very different moral value? As I have already indicated, the same effect of equivocation is achieved in the portrait of Hickey by the use of internal dialogue. A question and an-
swear form is used to discover Hickey's single fault. The very fact of asking whether or not Hickey has a certain fault raises doubt. Does the questioner have reason to suspect that Hickey has this particular fault? Conversely, a strongly negative reply to the question may imply that Hickey has the opposite fault to that which has been suggested. The faults that are suggested also fit into the scheme of contrasts and parallels in the poem—for example, "Perhaps he confided in men as they go,/And so was too foolishly honest; ah, no" (ll. 133-34). Hickey is not "too foolishly honest," but may it not be a good quality to trust one's fellow men? Hickey, it would seem, is secretive about himself. He is somewhat like Thomas Barnard, who hides his faults, and totally unlike Goldsmith, who is "too foolishly honest," since he punningly calls himself a fool and since he openly includes himself among those who are satirized for their faults.

The final line of the epitaph on Hickey depends for its effect on something quite apart from the context provided by contrasts and parallels in the poem. The epitaph on Hickey operates within a long tradition of satirizing lawyers, particularly as cheats and avaricious men. This tradition is especially strong in the eighteenth century. The examples are legion. Pope speaks of "vile Attornies" in the Epistle to Bathurst (l. 274) and about the lawyers who inundate Britain in his Imitation of The Second Satire of Dr. John Donne (ll. 85-86). Samuel Johnson appears to have entertained a low opinion of the profession, as can be concluded from the following passage from Boswell's Life of Johnson:

Much enquiry having been made concerning a gentleman, who had quitted a company where Johnson was, and no information being obtained; at last Johnson observed, that "he did not care to speak ill of any man behind his back, but he believed the gentleman was an attorney."
In the fifth number of *The Bee*, Goldsmith writes,

> The pawnbroker, the attorney, and other pests of society, might, by proper management, be turned into serviceable members; and, were their trades abolished, it is possible the same avarice that conducts the one, or the same chicanery that characterizes the other, might, by proper regulations, be converted into frugality, and commendable prudence.

(I, 441)

In *The Vicar of Wakefield* George Primrose tells of the young gentleman to whom he acted as travelling tutor on a tour through France and Italy:

> "He was heir to a fortune of about two hundred thousand pounds, left him by an uncle in the West Indies; and his guardians, to qualify him for the management of it, had bound him apprentice to an attorney. Thus avarice was his prevailing passion..." (IV, 120). The sense of consequence implied by the word "Thus," in this passage from *The Vicar*, depends rather on the reader's low estimation of attorneys than on a logical premise explicitly stated. The result is a fine comic touch. It is this traditional treatment of lawyers, suggested here by a few illustrations, which makes an effective climax of the revelation of Joseph Hickey's single fault in *Retaliation*: "Then what was his failing? come tell it, and burn ye,/He was, could he help it? a special attorney" (ll. 135-36).^23

James Prior suggests that in Goldsmith's personal encounters with Joseph Hickey, particularly during Goldsmith's trip to Paris in the summer of 1770, the attorney's unpolished mind and manners failed to make a favourable impression on the poet. Prior comments on the epitaph in *Retaliation*: "These lines, with all the delicate dexterity shown in sketching nearly all the characters in that production hint more than they express . . . ."^24 The epitaph on Joseph Hickey has been generally regarded as one of the better minor portraits in *Retaliation*, if a favourable critical evaluation may be inferred from frequency of quotation. ^25 The most highly
regarded of the major portraits, next to the epitaph on Garrick, is that on Edmund Burke. As in the portrait of Hickey, so in the portrait of Burke one of Goldsmith's techniques is equivocation between praise and censure. Certain phrases seem to reflect simultaneously in two directions. Goldsmith says that Burke is "too proud for a wit" (l. 38). This may very well be a compliment: the kind of wits that Goldsmith has in mind are quite likely low and obsequious, only achieving wit through loss of dignity. Still, the matter of how much pride Burke possesses has been left open: might not Burke be guilty of the sin of pride? Or, on the other hand, might not Burke wish to be considered a "wit"? Goldsmith's "delicate dexterity" in Retaliation consists partly of this effect of equivocation. The occasion of the poem for Goldsmith seemed to be one which demanded that most of the criticism be indirect. His primary audience, it should not be forgotten, was a group of highly literate men, who might be expected to be more receptive to subtleties of this kind than would the larger public reached by the more popular satires of Goldsmith's day.

Edmund Burke, as he is portrayed by Goldsmith, is essentially a man who has misapplied his great intelligence and sound learning. The essences of the characters of Edmund and William Burke are both clearly expressed in Goldsmith's portraits. The portrait of Edmund Burke, however, commands much greater credibility, due to the larger number of details through which his essence is bodied forth. According to Goldsmith, Edmund Burke is one

Who, born for the Universe, narrow'd his mind,
And to party gave up, what was meant for mankind.
Tho' fraught with all learning, kept straining his throat,
To persuade Tommy Townsend to lend him a vote;
Who, too deep for his hearers, still went on refining,
And thought of convincing, while they thought of dining;
Tho' equal to all things, for all things unfit,
Too nice for a statesman, too proud for a wit:
For a patriot too cool; for a drudge, disobedient,
And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.

(11. 31-40)
The word "too" dominates this passage, emphasizing how ill suited Edmund Burke appears, to Goldsmith, for the career he has chosen. The portrait of Burke is strongly marked by parallelism and antithesis. In the passage quoted, there are a number of structural parallels. Lines thirty-one and thirty-five introduce compound relative clauses. The second half of each relative clause is introduced by the coordinating conjunction "And" in lines thirty-two and thirty-six. The parallelism is continued in lines thirty-three and thirty-seven, both of which begin with the word "Tho'." The antitheses are numerous: Between "party" and "mankind," between "convincing" and "dining," and between "the right" and "the expedient." These lines are among the most balanced and urbane in the entire poem. The implication is that Goldsmith has carefully weighed each of Burke's actions and character-traits before having arrived at a judgement of his character.

In the minor portraits, with the exception of the epitaph on Douglas, Goldsmith mainly pokes fun. In the portrait of Burke—at least until the final couplet, in which there is a lowering of tone—Goldsmith uses the anapaestic couplet in much the same way Swift had in several of his anapaestic character-sketches: the major structural devices are those commonly associated with the heroic couplet.

In fact, Goldsmith's portrait of Edmund Burke is, in some respects, similar to Pope's portrait of the Duke of Wharton in the Epistle to Cobham. Wharton shares at least a couple of things with Burke. Both are politicians, and both have great natural gifts. Four lines from Pope's portrait will show further similarities:

A constant Bounty which no friend has made;
An angel Tongue, which no man can persuade;
A Fool, with more of Wit than half mankind,
Too quick for Thought, for Action too refin'd. . . .

(ll. 198-201)
While both Burke and Wharton are excellent orators, neither has much success at persuasion. Wharton cannot persuade anyone, and Burke's audience thinks rather of dinner than of his speeches. Again, the adverb "too" is used to emphasize the satiric target's unsuitability for certain activities. Burke is not suited to be a politician, at least not if he works for the good of party instead of mankind and not when parliament is composed of such men as Tommy Townshend. Wharton, on the other hand, is not suited for such fundamental human activities as action and thought. Pope's satire on Wharton is harsher than Goldsmith's on Burke, but both portraits are mild in comparison to the attack on Sporus. In the Wharton portrait, as in the portrait of Burke, there is frequent use of antithesis and relative absence of conventional metaphor. It is tempting to suggest that Pope's less vituperative sketches are marked by antithesis and parallelism, and his more virulent satiric portraits, though frequently antithetical, marked by an abundance of imagery. Animal imagery, in particular, is much better suited to the strains of heroic hatred in the Sporus portrait than to the balanced and urbane tones of the Wharton sketch. If a lack of conventional imagery does, in fact, characterize Pope's milder satiric portraits, then it is not surprising that Goldsmith's *Retaliation*, which is milder satire yet, should have little or nothing of the imagery of animals, decay, filth, and the demonic, which so frequently serves to degrade the targets of eighteenth-century satire.

The second major portrait in *Retaliation*, that of Richard Cumberland, presents few details of characteristic behaviour and concentrates rather on dramatic criticism, a procedure which has resulted in serious difficulties for interpretation. It seems clear that Goldsmith criticizes Cumberland the dramatist, but his attitude toward Cumberland the man is not quite so accessible. I have already noted that Cumberland regarded the epitaph
as wholly complimentary and that Mrs. Thrale thought that he had missed Goldsmith's subtle irony. A similar division of opinion may be found among critics from Goldsmith's time down to the present day. Some critics believe that the epitaph was intended to be personally complimentary; others, that it was intended as an ironic assault on Cumberland's vanity. At the centre of this critical debate are the concluding lines of the epitaph, in which Goldsmith attempts to determine why Cumberland's fools are so very good-hearted:

Say was it that vainly directing his view,
To find out men's virtues and finding them few,
Quite sick of pursuing each troublesome elf,
He grew lazy at last and drew from himself?
(ll. 75-78)

These four lines are presented as an unanswered question. It seems quite probable, but by no means certain, that Goldsmith intended that an affirmative answer should be understood. The possibility, though slight, remains that Cumberland may not have drawn his virtuous fools from himself at all. If he did so, however, then it signifies laziness; and this charge may not be a mere poking of fun at a friend, for Cumberland's laziness is juxtaposed to Douglas's praiseworthy toils. Another ambiguity is found in the word "vainly." Did Cumberland direct his view in vain, because virtue was hardly to be found? Or did he direct his view toward society out of pride and arrogance? The latter possibility cannot be easily dismissed, for Cumberland has been said to have possessed "a vanity that almost defies successful caricature." Lines from a satiric portrait of an earlier playwright may offer an instructive parallel to the case of Cumberland:

Yet still thy fools shall stand in thy defence,
And justify their Author's want of sense.
Let 'em be all by thy own model made
Of dullness, and desire no foreign aid:
Shadwell forms his fools on the model of his own dullness; Cumberland, on the model of his own virtue. But Dryden's charge against Shadwell is not confined to the sin of dullness. He deplores the solipsistic attitudes that he discovers behind Shadwell's wit. Shadwell, like the Spider in The Battle of the Books, excretes his material entirely from himself. A mimetic artist must draw the external world, or, at least, he must not present what has been drawn from himself as though it is an imitation of the real world. Dryden and Swift do not separate the literary artist from the moral agent, and some of the habits of thinking of Dryden and Swift remained in force as long as their works exerted a vital influence. In An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning (1759), Goldsmith explores the connection between taste and morality. Goldsmith recognizes, however, that it may be an overly close involvement with his subject that causes him to deduce an universal degeneracy of manners, from so slight an origin as the depravation of taste; to assert, that as a nation grows dull, it sinks into debauchery. Yet such, probably, may be the consequence of literary decay; or, not to stretch the thought beyond what it will bear, vice and stupidity are always mutually productive of each other.

Goldsmith's attitudes here are similar to those of earlier poets in his assessment of the role of art in society and, specifically, in his recognition of the effects of dullness on morals.

The main target, of course, of the final four lines of the Cumberland epitaph is a society in which virtue is so rare that it can hardly be found in order to be imitated by the literary artist. Such a society should prompt the mimetic writer to compose satirical, not sentimental, comedy. Goldsmith was opposed to sentimental dramatic writing during the
entire quarter century of his writing career. In *Polite Learning* he views sentimental comedy as evidence of the depravation of taste in his critical age:

HOWEVER, by the power of one single monosyllable, our critics have almost got the victory over humour amongst us. Does the poet paint the absurdities of the vulgar; then he is low: does he exaggerate the features of folly, to render it more thoroughly ridiculous, he is then very low. In short, they have proscribed the comic or satirical muse from every walk but high life, which, though abounding in fools as well as the humblest station, is by no means so fruitful in absurdity.

(I, 320)

In 1773 Goldsmith's "Essay on the Theatre" was published, possibly in preparation for the "laughing" comedy of *She Stoops to Conquer*. Goldsmith refers to sentimental comedy as a "species of Bastard Tragedy" (III, 212), and he notes that among the ancients Terence approached the nearest to this type of mixed genre (III, 211). This is one of the reasons that Cumberland is called "The Terence of England" in *Retaliation* (1. 62). Other reasons are possible. Cumberland's *Choleric Man*, which was first produced some eight months after the publication of *Retaliation*, was based on Terence's *Adelphi*. If Goldsmith knew of Cumberland's plans for this play, he may very well have called Cumberland the English Terence for this reason. There is something extravagant about the comparison of Richard Cumberland to one of the greatest classical dramatists, and Goldsmith may have included such an overblown, though double-edged, compliment as a matter of ironic course in the writing of mock-epitaphs. Goldsmith, as has been noted, was well aware of the false flatteries endemic to lapidary verses.

The portrait of Cumberland is central to the web of contrasts in Goldsmith's *Retaliation*. Cumberland is "A flattering painter, who made it his care/To draw men as they ought to be, not as they are" (ll. 63-64).
In his "Essay on the Theatre," Goldsmith attributes the popularity of sentimental comedy to its "flattering every man in his favourite foible" (III, 212). Cumberland's drama approaches what Samuel Butler called a "fools' paradise of what should be, not what is." In contrast to Cumberland is Reynolds, who was "Still born to improve us in every part, / His pencil our faces, his manners our heart" (11. 141-42). Both Cumberland and Reynolds represent men as better than they actually are, but Reynolds should do so and Cumberland should not: Reynolds works in the high mimetic form of portrait-painting; Cumberland claims to work in the lower genre of comedy. Goldsmith refers to Aristotle for his definition of comedy (III, 210), and we may turn to the Poetics for this distinction between higher and lower mimetic forms: "It is just in this respect that tragedy differs from comedy. The latter sets out to represent people as worse than they are to-day, the former as better" (Chapter ii); and further, "Since tragedy is a representation of men better than ourselves we must copy the good portrait-painters who, while rendering the individual outline and making likenesses, yet paint people better than they are" (Chapter xv). Reynolds may thus be an admirable painter, while Cumberland misapplies his talents in the production of "bastard tragedies." The positioning of the portrait of Cumberland between that of Richard Burke and that of Dr. Douglas provides the strongest evidence that Goldsmith carefully arranged his epitaphs in order to facilitate the contrasts from which his satiric norms might be inferred. Richard Burke was an amusing man, who laughed at everything. Dr. Douglas exposed hypocrisy and folly wherever it appeared in society. Together Richard Burke and Dr. Douglas supply a norm for comedy. Cumberland's comedies should both have amused and have exposed folly, but according to Goldsmith they failed on both counts.
In the representation of his dramatic characters, Cumberland offends against truth. Goldsmith hints at a similar offence in the portrait of David Garrick. Garrick, however, is not faulted for false representations in the theatre: "On the stage he was natural, simple, affecting. . ." (l. 101). But where Garrick should be most sincere and most natural, in the company of his friends—there, "a dupe to his art" (l. 98)—he seeks to impress: "Like an ill judging beauty, his colours he spread,/And be-plaister'd, with rouge, his own natural red" (ll. 99-100). This couplet fits into a long literary tradition in which truth is known by its native simplicity, and falsehood or vice by a glossy veneer, by a painted face, or by the glitter of jewels. Samuel Butler's Theophrastan Character of "A Player" partakes of the same literary tradition. Butler refers to man's tendency to prefer fiction to truth, even though "All ornament and dress is but disguise, which plain and naked truth does never put on" (p. 301). Goldsmith, however, plays on the tradition. The "rouge" which is a necessary part of the actor's equipment is not noticeable when Garrick is on the stage, but only at other times when rouge should not have been worn. Garrick, too, misuses great talents, for he acts when it is not only unnecessary, but wrong, to do so. Garrick, as he is portrayed by Goldsmith, seems incapable of forming true friendships, though Goldsmith balances this criticism with an indication of the fascination with which Garrick's companions behold him: "For he knew when he pleased he could whistle them back" (l. 108).

Like Cumberland, Garrick is viewed by Goldsmith as a vain man. His vanity is shown through the convincing details of his susceptibility to praise:

Of praise, a mere glutton, he swallowed what came,
And the puff of a dunce, he mistook it for fame;
'Till his relish grown callous, almost to disease,
Who pepper'd the highest, was surest to please.
But let us be candid, and speak out our mind,
If dunces applauded, he paid them in kind.
(ll. 109-14)

The portrait of Garrick is the longest and most detailed in the poem, and it holds its own with some of the best works in the eighteenth-century tradition of the literary portrait. While it is more a balanced character-sketch than a harshly satirical one, it appears to contain as much satire as any portrait in *Retaliation*. In the passage on Garrick's lust for praise, the imagery is very physical. There is little of the gross physical sense of gluttony and swallowing elsewhere in the poem, even though Goldsmith's delicacy induces him to stop short of actual disease. The eating imagery for flattery and the payment for the puffs of dunces made in kind echo the Bufo portrait in *An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*:

Proud, as Apollo on his forked hill,
Sate full-blown Bufo, puff'd by ev'ry quill;
Fed with soft Dedication all day long,
Horace and he went hand in hand in song.

Till grown more frugal in his riper days,
He pay'd some Bards with Port, and some with Praise,
To some a dry Rehearsal was assign'd,
And others (harder still) he pay'd in kind.

(ll. 231-34, 241-44)

Like Bufo, Garrick is fed by flattery. The portrait of Garrick in Goldsmith's higher style of anapaestic couplet—it includes an apostrophe to Kenrick, Kelly, Woodfall, and their ilk—is climactic because it is the best portrait in the poem and also because it contains several lines of the most intense satire in *Retaliation*. The portrait is also climactic because the "retaliation" of the title is most obvious in these lines. In response to Garrick's clever comment on Goldsmith's height in the phrase "for shortness call'd Noll," Goldsmith produces an equally clever comment on Garrick's height, referring to him as "An abridgement of all that was
pleasant in man" (l. 94; my emphasis). And Goldsmith reflects on Garrick's "wrote like an angel" in the ambiguous phrase, "To act as an angel, and mix with the skies" (l. 120). Several of the important themes of Retaliation find expression in the epitaph on Garrick: the emphasis on truth, as opposed to both insincerity and false flattery, and the concern for proper use of talents. Garrick shares the lack of judgement ("Like an ill judging beauty"—l. 99) and the apparent capriciousness ("He turn'd and he varied full ten times a day"—l. 104) of the minor Burkes. Ricardo Quintana notes that the portrait of Garrick "shows throughout a good-natured, perfectly poised ambiguity of judgement."33 The portrait of Garrick draws together many of the themes and techniques that Goldsmith has used in Retaliation and goes a long way toward providing a unified focus for the poem.

More than any other character in the poem Joshua Reynolds serves as a satiric norm. Reynolds's wisdom lies in opposition to the lack of wisdom characteristic of William and Richard Burke. The description of Reynolds's pencil as "striking, resistless and grand" (l. 139) indicates that he works in a high mimetic form and, unlike Cumberland, is entitled to portray characters as better than they really are. His pencil did in actuality improve Goldsmith's face—perhaps, at least for his immediate audience, the line would have hinted at self-portrayal—and his manners could readily improve the unpolished manners of a Hickey. The sketch of Reynolds ends with two characteristic gestures of Reynolds's physical behaviour—using an ear trumpet and taking snuff. Perhaps it is appropriate that the epitaph for a portrait-painter should be imagined in a more pictorial manner than the other portraits in the poem. These characteristic actions were described, in the Explanatory Notes which accompanied early editions of the poem, "to be as happily given upon paper, as that great Artist himself, perhaps, could have exhibited upon canvas!" (Fried-
A final half-line on Reynolds, which is said to have been the last thing that Goldsmith ever wrote, is quoted as "By flattery unspoiled" (Friedman, IV, 359n). If this half-line is authentic, the Reynolds portrait would have made a still stronger satiric norm when completed, for Reynolds would have shown the appropriate attitude toward flattery in contrast to David Garrick.

As I suggested in the first chapter of this thesis, in the *Imitations of Horace* the poet himself represents one of the more important expressions of the satiric norm. Given the radically different manner of self-portrayal in *Retaliation*, Goldsmith had to seek other means of conveying his norms. First, he appears to have used an adaptation of the portrait-gallery structure in which the portraits of inadequate individuals are followed at the end of the poem by the portrait of a normative individual—in this case, Sir Joshua Reynolds. Secondly, Goldsmith wrote character-sketches in which faults are balanced by virtues, and in the poem as a whole one man's virtue provides the norm by which another man's fault may be judged. Thirdly, Goldsmith used imagery to supply norms, as in the "coachman/chariot" metaphor in the epitaph on William Burke and the "ill judging beauty" simile in the epitaph on Garrick. The simile in the Garrick portrait likewise illustrates Goldsmith's use of literary, and especially satiric, traditions. Sometimes satiric tradition is played upon for comic ends, as is the case with the traditional satire on lawyers which the portrait of Hickey depends upon for its effect. In the instance, however, of the rouge which signifies Garrick's insincerity, the intent is wholly serious. Goldsmith's balanced method of portraiture is often subtly transformed into equivocation between praise and blame, achieving, for example, what Oliver W. Ferguson calls the "delicate ambiguity" of the epitaph on Cumberland. Frequently the effect of equivocation is obtained through Goldsmith's
use of internal dialogue, primarily structured in question and answer form. Delicacy was required of Goldsmith because he was writing for friends and companions about themselves; delicacy was permitted because Goldsmith's intended audience was highly literate. The occasion determined a great deal about Goldsmith's poem. The situation of the dinner club could only produce a comic and playful poem. *Retaliation* could hardly be expected to have the persistent moral purpose of *The Traveller* and *The Deserted Village*. The diverse portrait types in *Retaliation* were likewise determined by the occasional nature of the poem. Goldsmith was required to sketch men of whom he had no special knowledge, and thus he decided to compose several portraits in which the emphasis was on epigrammatic wit instead of considered analysis of character. Only the epitaphs on Edmund Burke and Garrick are wholly successful as portraits, because only these have sufficient strength of representative detail. Most of the other epitaphs succeed but in other ways than as literary portraits. The minor portraits lie in the tradition of anapaestic epigrams and epitaphs; the major portraits, in the tradition of the more important eighteenth-century satiric portraits, most of which are in heroic couplets. Corresponding to this division into minor and major is a general lowering and raising of the style in which the anapaestic couplet is written. Even in the major portraits, however, Goldsmith does not have at his disposal some of the resources which Pope had in his satiric portraits. The scheme of the epitaph does not allow Goldsmith to scrutinize, as Pope does, "his characters' dim 'internal view' of themselves";\(^\text{35}\) and such internal portrayal is perhaps Pope's greatest strength as a literary portraitist. The epitaphs in *Retaliation* are basically portrayals from the outside. Only with self-portrayal in Goldsmith do we have to a significant extent the added dimension of the internal man. Since Goldsmith characterizes his friends
under their real names, he is denied one of the means of typification that Dryden, Swift, and Pope had at their disposal. Nevertheless, its occasional nature does not, by any means, prevent Retaliation from being an excellent and, I believe, a lasting poem. John Forster was right to say that the plan of Goldsmith's poem "had grown far beyond its original purpose" of "retaliation."
Notes


2. See Friedman's notes to the poems. In his biography The Notable Man: The Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977), John Ginger asserts that Goldsmith had "a tendency to give up when his material seemed to resist his efforts to get it into shape" (pp. 180-81). Ralph W. Rader believes that Goldsmith's difficulty in completing The Deserted Village was the result of a conflict between didactic intention and lyric presence ("The Concept of Genre and Eighteenth-Century Studies," in New Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Literature: Selected Papers from the English Institute, ed. Phillip Harth [New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1974], p. 101).


9. I have taken this information from Frederick A. De Armas, Paul Scarron, TWAS, 194 (New York: Twayne, 1972), pp. 5, 34.


12 Leigh Hunt criticizes Goldsmith for these inconsistencies; see his "Goldsmith: Critical Essay on His Writings," in Classic Tales (London: John Hunt and Carew Reynell, 1806), I, 51.


15 Wecter, p. 108.


25 P. K. Elkin (pp. 192-93) quotes the entire sketch of Hickey, as does Ralph M. Wardle, Oliver Goldsmith (Lawrence: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1957), pp. 281-32.


Ferguson, p. 117. Contemporaries remarked on Cumberland's vanity: "Mr. Cumberland is unquestionably a man of very considerable abilities; 'tis his misfortune to rate them greatly above their real value, and to suppose that he has no equal" (Thomas Davies, Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq. [London: Printed for the Author, 1780], II, 275).


See Ferguson, pp. 113-14.

I quote from Butler as he is quoted in Ricardo Quintana, "Samuel Butler: A Restoration Figure in a Modern Light," ELH, 18 (1951), 16.


Ferguson, p. 119.
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